

*"We do not take possession of our ideas, but are possessed by them.
They master us and force us into the arena,
Where, like gladiators, we must fight for them."*

—HEINE.

THE ARENA

VOL. XXV.

APRIL, 1901.

No. 4.

THE PASSING OF THE DECLARATION.

IT is not the design of this paper to attempt either to justify or to arraign the motives and present tendencies of the United States concerning its self-evident ambition for international supremacy. That ambition, while unquestionably a fact, yet, so far from being in the nature of a transient fancy excited by recent military and naval successes, is an original instinct planted in the very constitution of Anglo-Saxon character and attested by the continuous drift of fifteen hundred years.

That the Anglo-Saxon is predestined by his own racial conditions to be a controlling factor in world politics need hardly be affirmed, and, if we may form conclusions from the past and present stages of his historic development, there seems to be no disposition on his part to avoid that destiny. He has been as inclusive in his ambition, as aggressive in his policy, as ruthless in his conquest, as the Roman ever was, and far more successful in his administration. But he will never admit that, like the Roman, the basic principle of his empire has been the domination of force. Both the Englishman and the American, but particularly the latter, have an inherent and apparently ineradicable hostility to calling things by their right names and looking facts squarely in the face—an inconsistency of precept and practise that tends not unnaturally to throw distrust upon the sincerity of our attachment to certain well-known and much

protested principles. It was the consciousness of this fact in a few of the more sensitive minds and its application to contemporary conditions that furnished the main text for the fulminations of the Opposition during the recent period of political debate—an opposition sound in theory but contrary to the testimony of historical facts. As a matter of theory, "imperialism" in any form is repugnant to American ideals. As a matter of fact, we have been, and are to-day more than ever, an imperialistic nation, and an imperialistic nation with a more vital and intense significance than the most zealous expansionist of five months ago probably imagined.

It is not the purpose of this essay to disparage our national genius or to find fault with the "course of empire," but merely to submit in brief outline a few of the historic and material inconsistencies between government as theoretically conceived and government as practically administered by the American people; and finally, if the facts adduced shall warrant the conclusion, respectfully to suggest that we henceforth exclude from our political phraseology those extravagant professions of superior inspiration of which our national utterance is full, and concerning which our national history has been a continuous refutation.

It was urged during the recent campaign that the United States should not attempt the business of ruling subject colonies, for the reason that such a course would be contrary to the Declaration of Independence and a plain departure from our constitutional intent; or, as expressed in the somewhat specious phrase of the Kansas City platform—"The Filipinos cannot be citizens without endangering our civilization; they cannot be subjects without imperiling our form of government." Undoubtedly it is contrary to the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence to hold the Filipinos as subjects under any pretense whatever, because such holding implies, first, the assumption of racial superiority, and, second, the right of the superior by reason of that superiority to rule—both of which assumptions the Declaration of Independence clearly denies. But, on the other hand, that instrument is contrary to

the Constitution of the United States, and not only that, but contrary to the common necessities of any government as well as to the common sense of mankind.

The Declaration of Independence tolerates no discrimination against persons, knows no superiority of one over another, and approves no government as just that does not find its source and sanction in the theory of popular sovereignty. The Constitution of the United States recognizes all three, and imposes an external and superior authority over a vast majority of inhabitants who are without any voice in government either direct or representative. It is difficult to harmonize "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" with the almost general exclusion by the various States of the Union of a majority of their inhabitants from the exercise of suffrage. Theoretically the forty-five States of the Union are forty-five commonwealths whose constitutional and statutory enactments are determined *voce populi*. Practically they are so many oligarchies based on qualifications of age, sex, mental acquirement, and whatever additional limitations the ruling class sees fit to make. It will be no innovation in principle for the United States to administer laws to colonial dependencies and govern distant subjects from the "imperial city." In a sense, all are *subjects* who owe allegiance to government; but there is a specific and technical sense in which the term properly belongs to our American system, however distasteful that fact may be to our democratic sentiments.

To begin with, the subject state may be predicated of all *women* in all States except five. They constitute more than one-half the population of the country. Add to these all men of less than twenty-one years of age, who form not far from one-half the remainder. These two classes, comprising the vast majority of the citizenship of this country, have no voice in its legislation and no initiative in the determination of their own interests. So with the Territories. Here all the inhabitants, whether men or women, minors or adults, are subjects *par excellence*, governed by an exterior power and taxed without any semblance to the right of representation. They may

not vote for President, nor participate in national legislation, nor elect their own judiciary, but are governed by the Congress of the United States and by officials appointed by the highest executive authority. It is a fundamental principle of Anglo-American jurisprudence that judges shall be irremovable by the Executive power. This guaranty has been persistently denied to the Territories, and there is no Territorial judge who is not liable to removal at any time by the President of the United States—a fact that suggests the question, What becomes of the inviolability of the courts? There is no essential difference, so far as the matter of rights is concerned, between the American Territories of to-day and the thirteen colonies before the Revolutionary war. The rights of the colonies depended wholly upon the imperial will; that is, the will of the Executive power. So do the rights of the Territories to-day. When the imperial will changed, the rights of the colonies changed; and so at any time may the rights of the Territories change and even disappear with the fluctuations of the Executive mind. True, the Territories may in time become States, although the Constitution contains no guaranty that they shall, since it was the plain intention of the framers of that document that we should, if we wanted to, hold dependencies and hold them indefinitely and never allow them to become anything else. Utah was denied Statehood for fifty years. Arizona and New Mexico have been seeking admittance to the Union for more than fifty years, and are still on the "waiting list" with the apparent probability of remaining there.

Take another aspect of this same thought. This nation itself came into being through an act of unquestionably usurpative and imperialistic nature. The years immediately following the Revolutionary war found the newly independent States internally in a condition of grave danger—the result of financial disorder and general governmental inutility. At the instigation of a few prominent individuals a convention was appointed to remedy the existing defects by amending the Articles of Confederation. The purpose of the convention, as

declared, was simply to *amend*; not to abrogate, not to substitute for the old government under Articles of Confederation a new and different government under a Constitution. It was not in any sense a popular body; it was not even a representative body. It met behind closed doors and remained there in secret conclave for four months, and when it emerged the old government had been overthrown and a new and essentially different government instituted in its place.

We are told that our political system is not adapted to imperial government, and that so long as it retains its present form such an event is impossible. It might be impossible if the reason alleged were true, but as a matter of fact the Constitution was conceived after the imperial type and has since steadily developed along imperial lines. There are but two kinds of constitution possible to any government—the *regal* and the *parliamentary*. In the regal the Executive, whether King or President, has independent executive powers, while in the parliamentary he has not. It makes no difference in the essence of the office whether the Executive be elected for four years and called a President, or whether he hold by descent and be called a King. Until the Revolution of 1688 the English government was regal; from then until 1832 it was in a transition period, and since 1832 it has been parliamentary. Now, the American Constitution was framed during this transition period of English constitutional development, but it adopted the regal type, which it has since continued to hold. Under the English Constitution to-day the Cabinet has all executive power and the monarch none, and the monarch may not even participate in the deliberations of the Cabinet. Under the American system the President is absolutely independent of the legislative branch. His Cabinet officers are appointed by himself and to him they are solely responsible. Congress has no authority over them whatever, and cannot even require them to account for anything they may do.

The last time the power of veto was used by the Crown in England was in 1707—in the reign of Queen Anne. Contrast this with the three hundred and one vetoes of President Cleve-

land during the four years of his first term. Contrast the dependency and limited executive power of the British Cabinet with the autocratic rule of Andrew Johnson, opposed by two-thirds and more of the Senate and the House and by a majority of the people of the United States. There is no monarch in Europe, with the exception of the Sultan of Turkey and the Czar of Russia, who possesses independent powers of so dictatorial a type as the President of the United States, and none to whom the title of *Imperator* may be more logically and truthfully applied. He cannot legislate, it is true; but he can annul legislation by refusing to execute the laws. He is Commander-in-chief of all the military forces of the United States on land and on sea, with every protection to secrecy of action and intent, and in time of war he is virtually censor of the press. In short, the possibilities inherent in the office of President for the exercise of personal tyranny are immeasurable.

The Presidential campaign of 1900 has so far familiarized the public with the main facts in the history of our territorial acquisitions as to render unnecessary their further citation for the purpose of argument. Suffice it to say that every addition to our national area, from the purchase of Louisiana in 1803 down to the Spanish cessions of 1898, was made without any consideration by our government for the racial and political prejudices of the purchased or stolen people, and in plain derogation of what in the phraseology of the Declaration of Independence we are accustomed to call the "inalienable rights of man."

In 1846, so lightly did we esteem the principles of that instrument that the United States Government authorized a military invasion of a foreign country in order forcibly to annex to its own domain a coveted slice of *terra firma* to which it had not the faintest shadow of legal or moral right, and the declared purpose of whose acquisition was to extend and perpetuate the institution of human slavery. Here we have three official disavowals, distinct and unequivocal, of the fundamental doctrines of the Declaration and a plain denial of any intention to be governed by them as a nation when in the pur-

suit of political or military advantage: first in unwarranted and forcible seizure of foreign territory, with a consequently unjustifiable war to back it up, followed by the devotion of that territory when acquired to the aggressive spread of an oppressive and inhuman industrial system; while the people, pleased beyond measure with the glorious achievement of their arms, took the earliest and most tangible method of expressing their satisfaction by elevating to the Presidency the man who had been the most conspicuous military figure of the enterprise, and who owed his popularity solely to the fact that under his generalship it had been brought to a successful termination.

There has never been an Indian war in the entire history of the country, from early colonial times down to the last feeble outbreak in the remote West, where the white man was not the aggressor—if not immediately, then primarily. His very appearance on this continent was an invasion of aboriginal rights, and the record of his conquests, inscribed in blood, quite obscures the sentimentalities of the Declaration of Independence.

But the capital instance of the exercise of imperial powers by the United States Government, and its sanction by a majority of the people, is the American civil war. Now, as a question of purely abstract right, the seceding States were undoubtedly correct in their position. The Constitution was originally a compact between thirteen independent sovereignties whereby certain rights were surrendered by them to the Federal Government and certain others were retained. Among the latter the right of secession was expressly reserved by the States of New York and Virginia, and Rhode Island and South Carolina refused to enter the Union until that right had been put beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt. The right of secession was subsequently affirmed and reaffirmed by different States on different occasions: notably in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798-'99, three times by the Legislature of Massachusetts (in 1802, 1844, and 1845), and by all the New England States during the war of 1812. Nor was it at any time prior to 1860 seriously ques-

tioned in any quarter except under the exigencies of party politics. Moreover, the action of the seceding South was supported by actual precedent; for when the nine States of the old Confederation accepted the Constitution they seceded from their former government. It was a secession in the literal sense of the term, since it was a withdrawal of territory; and the fact that it was accomplished behind closed doors, without an appeal to force, does not affect the character of the act.

But there was another and a philosophical reason to support the principle of secession. It is to be found in the fact that, since the parties to the contract were sovereign States, there was no superior tribunal to which the question of State rights could be referred. The Federal courts were not competent to pass upon it, because they were the creatures of the Union and the Union was in turn the creature of the States. In the event, then, of a dispute between the States and the Union over the question of respective powers, should the Union, the creature, be permitted to say how much power it received, or should the State, the creator, determine how much power it conferred? In all logic and justice there can be but one answer. Manifestly the seceding States had the *right* to go. They had a right under the Constitution and they had the further right of *revolution*, expressly affirmed by the Declaration of Independence as being inherent in all communities and upon which each of the thirteen States had justified its secession from the mother country in 1776. But when the seceding States attempted to enforce that right, what did the Government of the United States do? It invaded their territory with all the military forces at its command, terrorized their inhabitants, destroyed their homes, violated their constitutionally guaranteed right of property by an executive act of unparalleled usurpation, and put to death on the field of battle as many as possible of those inhabitants who dared openly resist. And when at last the United States Government, by virtue of its superior resources and greater strength, had reduced the seceding States to subjection, it deprived them of their Statehood, overturned their home rule,

nullified their statutes, displaced their civil by its military jurisdiction, and forced upon them the alternative of either accepting the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution or remaining forever in the status of subjugated territory.

Far be it from any design of mine to call in question even for the intellectual pleasure of debate the decision of a controversy that ended in agony and blood thirty-five years ago. No reasonable man believes to-day that the result should have been in anywise different from what the stern arbitrament of war decreed. For, while logically and in principle secession was right, yet it was most fortunate for the South and for the country at large that it did not succeed. The strife and horror of that period, great as they were, have found this ample compensation in the establishment of a *nationality* whose power and fame have proved both the advantage and the necessity of a stronger Union than could have existed without the civil war. But the point I make is that the entire action of the United States Government toward the South, from 1860 until the last seceding State was "reconstructed," was imperialistic and usurpative in the extreme, and there is no possible constitutional or legal aspect that can make it anything else.

The purpose of this essay, as developed in the foregoing pages, is not to depreciate in any way American motives or intents as interpreted in the light of historic facts. It is simply to show that, notwithstanding its frequent and perfunctory avowals to the contrary, the United States has persistently refused, wherever its own interests have so dictated, to be governed in its conduct by that instrument whose maxims it pretends to accept as its God-given and infallible guide. Not that our military conquests require an apologist to set them right: they are merely so many necessary stages in the evolution of a Nation for which no justification is needed. But in their historic analysis their motives will not be found materially different from those that have actuated other portions of the human race in wars with which the records of

the past abound. It may be within the range of possibility for a great and powerful nation to make war for the real interests of humanity, and to extend, without the hope or expectation of reward, its active support to a weak and defenseless people in a life-and-death struggle with tyranny. But it has never yet been done, and the events of the last two years sufficiently prove that the United States is no exception to the rule.

The main trouble with the Anglo-Saxon in both branches of the family is that he constantly professes to act on higher principles than those that govern the policy of other nations. He is too fond of praying upon the housetops and in the public streets. Hence, when, in the pursuit of common ends or ambitions, he resorts to the usual methods of attainment, he is apt to be met with the not unreasonable charge of hypocrisy. This characteristic has distinguished the foreign policy of England to an almost nauseating degree, and is undoubtedly the secret of her unpopularity among the European powers. However benevolent may be the alleged objects of her design, that benevolence always coincides with the direction of England's real or fancied interests. As to our own government, we are compelled to admit the justice of similar conclusions if we accept the testimony of facts. Magnificent in its optimism as was the conception of a nation engaged in war for the relief of oppressed humanity, the chivalry of the situation is materially impaired by the indecorous and ill-concealed haste of the protector to avail himself of its commercial and political benefits. We went into the war with Spain professedly to free Cuba. We emerge with new and valuable possessions in two hemispheres; and the incorporation of Cuba itself with our system is a foregone conclusion of no distant date. So that virtually all the war accomplished, so far as any change in the actual relationship of Spain's former colonies is concerned, was to effect a transfer of sovereignty from Spain to us. Neither Cuba, Puerto Rico, nor the Philippines has achieved independence. They have simply exchanged masters—that is all: lenient masters in all probability, but masters nevertheless. Manifestly, in the light of previous history,

nothing else could reasonably have been expected. For fifty years the United States has been endeavoring to annex Cuba, advocating legal or forcible measures according to the expediency of the moment and only awaiting a favorable opportunity to act. Europe understands this perfectly, and is herself sufficiently accustomed to that sort of procedure to experience no surprise at the embarkation of the United States in predatory warfare.

The preëminent significance of the Spanish-American war lies in the fact that it has uncovered the essential humbug of the Declaration of Independence and demonstrated to the rest of the world the pretense and insincerity of our devotion to the doctrines therein set forth. Any attempt to explain our present policy, its causes or its results, as due to the "force of circumstances" and in Providential accord with the march of events, must fail to palliate the obvious aggression of the proceedings and can only react to the further discredit of the United States. Logically, then, there should follow the cessation of vain and inconsistent prating over the "consent of the governed," the "inalienable rights of man," and other claptrap phrases of the demagogue that we are accustomed to declaim on patriotic occasions and incorporate in political platforms for the purpose of catching votes.

It is fortunate for the immortality of Mr. Jefferson that his fame rests upon a more substantial basis than the authorship of the Declaration of Independence. It is not true in law; it is not true in history; it is not true in the possibilities of the human race. All men are *not* created free, but subject to restraint, human and natural. All men are *not* created equal, but conditioned by differences of various sorts placed upon them by Nature through the agencies of environment and heredity and by the distinctions of society. Governments do *not* "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Governments *have* no just powers, in the accurate and philosophic meaning of the term. They have *necessary* powers, since the constant presence of recognized authority is essential to the integrity of the social structure; but these

powers are asserted and in no sense delegated by the units of society. Nor is there, outside the sovereign power, any such thing as an "inalienable right," but all rights inhere in the *State*, whence they proceed and by whom they may be withheld or withdrawn at will. In discarding the Declaration of Independence, then, we shall lose nothing of political or moral value. We shall merely drop a few glittering phrases of French sophistry and exploded sham borrowed from the agitators and pamphleteers of the Revolutionary period, and which never have and never can become a serious part of any system of political truth.

We are engaged in building an Empire; that is to say, a great Nation, which is to incorporate other peoples and extend its laws and government to remote corners of the earth. This will necessitate the employment of methods distinctly hostile to the ideals of the Declaration of Independence. The extinguishment of petty States means the abrogation of the doctrine of self-government, but it should occasion no regret. It is not the course of Empire in conflict with the God-ordained principles of justice; it is presumptuous fallacy disputing the right of way with progress and necessity. The subjugation of small, independent States and their assimilation by the great Powers will remove the most fruitful cause of international jealousy and discontent; and it is the only proposition that offers any assurance of the ultimate fulfilment of the world's dream of universal peace.

LEON C. PRINCE.

Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.

PROFESSOR FISKE AND THE NEW THOUGHT.

THE charge of the religious world against science has always been that it tears down the old religious faiths and gives nothing to take their place; and to a degree the charge has, in the past at least, been well founded. The attitude of science has been indifference, agnosticism, and even aggressive materialism. Its avowal has been that science deals with facts having a material basis; that religion is an affair of the emotions—and so they have nothing in common. Then, unfortunately, religion had bound itself to a cosmogony, a chronology, and a theory of causes that science has gradually undermined and proved erroneous or altogether false; and literary criticism—only a branch of science—has shown religion pledged to many contradictions and errors of fact and history.

Science, finding religion associated so closely with much that was absolute error, discredited it altogether; and religion found itself constantly and often unsuccessfully upon the defensive. Then science, in turn, became aggressive and arrogant, claiming for itself the whole field of biology and psychology, declaring mind to be only a product of organism. It allowed itself to be represented by such men as Büchner and Haeckel, who declared off-hand that evolution *forbids* us to believe in a future life, and Moleschott, the author of the favorite epigram of the materialists, "No thought without phosphorus." Not that these men actually represented the best thought upon this subject in the scientific world, but they were outspoken and aggressive; and they gave an atheistic and materialistic coloring to the inductions of science that made the charge of destructive activity brought against science seem all the more valid.

But, notwithstanding all this hue and cry, the religious sentiment in man was not destroyed, nor even one whit diminished; and it arose in rebellion and indignation at the unproved *ex cathedra* statements of these self-constituted oracles of science.

But who at that time—in the sixties and early seventies—

had the scientific knowledge and the necessary courage, combined with a reverent spirit, to face these statements and show their falsity? On the religious side no champion appeared; but in 1874, at the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at Belfast, John Tyndall, the incoming president of the Association, stood up in that august assembly of savants and pronounced these memorable words: "Abandoning all disguise, the confession that I feel bound to make before you is, that I prolong the vision backward across the boundary of experimental evidence and discover in matter, which we, in our ignorance, and notwithstanding our professed reverence for its Creator, have hitherto covered with opprobrium, the promise and potency of every form and quality of life." In other words, Tyndall found the intelligent Force and Cause of evolution in matter itself. It was in all the matter in the universe, organic and inorganic; and, while Tyndall did not then so affirm, it was divine—it was the immanent Deity in Nature making all Nature divine, and man divine.

A howl of dissent went up from the world, both of Christianity and science. "He has gone out of the realm of science," said the scientific world. "He has found God," sarcastically growled the agnostic and materialist. "But it is not *our* God!" cried orthodox Christianity. So they stoned Tyndall, each in the name of his own particular shibboleth.

But the word had been spoken. Religious men with real scientific knowledge and reverent scientists joined hands; the first step toward a reconciliation between science and religion was taken, and *God manifest in Nature* was the first article in the unwritten compact. The old man-like God—outside his universe, working in man-like ways—is falling into desuetude, and the immanent God is hailed with joy by all to whom he manifests himself in the infinite grandeur, beauty, and uses of Nature. And so the foundation of a natural, in place of a supernatural, religion is laid; evolution has been accepted as a primal fact in every modern system of thought; God in Nature and the universality of law have been accepted by the best minds both in science and religion.

But long-cherished forms of thought disappear slowly; and, while the idea of the universality of law was in a general way accepted, it was thought necessary to preserve certain dogmas and doctrines of a supernatural character, the belief in which was deemed essential to accepted Christianity. To the support of these dogmas came a class of semi-scientific writers, and scientific writers with strong religious prejudices, maintaining that these dogmas were grounded in science and were in accordance with natural law. The best known of this latter class of writers was the late very earnest and fascinating author of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," a book of special pleading for certain sectarian dogmas, upon the ground of their accordance with natural law extending into the spiritual world. Doubtless the book made some very nice people think better of science—the kind there presented; but it is safe to say that it never made one really scientific person think better of religion.

Professor Fiske's still recent book, "Through Nature to God," is one of an entirely different stamp. It occupies a unique place, especially in its relation to the current of thought at present most deeply stirring intelligent minds throughout the world; namely, conceptions of God, an after life, and the consequent reality of religion. First he deals, from a scientific standpoint, with the troublesome problem of the existence of evil in a world supposed to be planned by an all-powerful and benevolent God; and the author makes this point: If the object of the evolution of man was the production of a moral being, that object could not in the nature of things have been accomplished without the presence of evil. Pain as a warning and guide was necessary for the evolution of the highest forms of physical organization, or even for the knowledge and enjoyment of pleasure; and moral evil as a background and contrast was necessary for the evolution and understanding of the highest moral good. No real moral quality could exist where only good was known or was possible. But evil was not introduced from without, nor unwillingly permitted by a Creator unable to prevent it; but both pain and evil were necessary elements in evolution—for the production of antagonism, strife,

effort, through which alone strength and forward movement were possible. And, looked down upon from a higher standpoint of wisdom, evil and pain are seen to be only comparative; and as evolution advances their most odious forms disappear, become eliminated, or at least they approach, and perhaps, as seen from the *highest* standpoint, become identical with good, "or lapse into a memory only, in which the shadowed past shall seem as a background for the realized glory of the present." But evil is not therefore to be indulged in; on the contrary, it is by antagonism and strife against evil, on the part of the individual, that moral progress is made, and it is also by that antagonism and strife that its more hideous forms are destroyed and the gradual approach to good accomplished.

In the second part of his discussion the author points out the relation of love and self-sacrifice to cosmic process—so introducing the ethical element, and showing that cosmic process has relation to moral as well as organic, physical ends. There he is on his own ground and shows his full power.

Calaban's theology, "As it likes me each time, I do: So He," is not satisfactory; nor in its bald statement is the sentiment of his friend Huxley, that "there is no sanction for morality in Cosmic Process," satisfactory. The earlier evolutionists in speaking of cosmic process referred almost exclusively to "modifications wrought in plants and animals by means of natural selection"; for it was by the observation of this process in Nature that the fact of evolution was established. But natural selection as a cosmic process working on physical organisms alone could never bridge over the immense psychical chasm between apes and man; "for, while for zoological or structural man you can hardly erect a distinct family from that of the chimpanzee, for psychological man you must erect a distinct kingdom."

How can this tremendous contrast between the slow physical changes, and the wonderfully rapid psychical changes, that went on in evolution from the primates to man be accounted for? Here two important elements in evolution are brought clearly into view—elements not always taken into account, and

perhaps hardly known to the general reader. The clue to one of these elements was furnished by Alfred Russell Wallace, the distinguished co-discoverer, with Darwin, of Natural Selection, and was in substance as follows: In the evolution of intelligence in the primates, or man-like apes, a point was at length reached where variations in intelligence were of more consequence to him in "getting on in the world" than variations in physical structure; and so intelligence instead of bodily peculiarities became the leading factor in natural selection. Intelligence then went on by gradual but rapid increments, adding new powers and new capacities, while the body changed but little; and by and by, after millions of years perhaps, he arrived at something approaching human intelligence. Natural selection had taken a new path; the more intelligent sought the more intelligent for mates instead of seeking advantages secured by organic peculiarities, and so by heredity the grade of intelligence began gradually to be raised. This was an observation of immense importance and threw a flood of light upon the causes of the great contrast between the structural difference appearing between man and the primates, which is only slight, and the psychical difference, which is world-wide.

The other important element in the psychic development of man was "the enormous increase in the duration of infancy, or the period when parental care is needed." The observation of this fact is the author's own special contribution to the subject of evolution, and he makes its importance distinctly manifest. There is abundant evidence that the speechless primates, like the inferior apes, were gregarious creatures; and the mother, like mothers in the still lower races,—the sheep and the cow,—while fully exercising the maternal instinct during the comparatively brief infancy of her offspring, soon lost that special regard for it. Her special affection lapsed into indifference, and later she hardly distinguished her own grown-up progeny from other members of the herd or troop of apes. But gradually, with the lengthening of the period of infancy and immature youth, in which the necessity for maternal care

and help was still strong, intelligence increased; the signals and vocal explosions—expression of pleasure or pain, hunger or repletion, love or hate, command or submission—developed into well-understood language, and so communication of thoughts and experiences was possible.

During the early and still immature years of the first-born, other progeny appeared—brothers or sisters—all still demanding the mother's care and affection; and so family ties, common interests, clanship—all arose in consequence of the lengthened period of infancy and immaturity, and the natural instinct of love and self-sacrifice, transitory in the lower races, now became permanent and continuous. Then, with the production of family ties and clanship, "there naturally arose reciprocal necessities of behavior among the members of the family and clan—its mothers and children, its hunters and warriors." They must stand together in advancing and protecting common interests; henceforward the conduct of the individual must be subordinate to the general welfare. In this way the ethical sense was established; for, the moment a man's voluntary actions are determined by a conscious or unconscious reference to a standard outside of himself, he has begun to live in a moral atmosphere; egoism has ceased to be all in all—altruism has begun to assert its claim to sovereignty. So love, self-sacrifice, ethics, altruism—all have their origin in cosmic process, and come forward to constitute a moral order, not by being injected into advancing humanity from without, but by the unfolding of that which was within through a continuous cosmic process of evolution.

The third and last division of the book deals with the religious sentiment in man. Our author considers that one of the greatest contributions ever made to scientific knowledge is Herbert Spencer's "profound and luminous exposition of Life, as the continuous adjustment of inner relations to outer relations." Whether this constitutes a satisfactory definition of *Life* or not, I may not be a competent judge. I can only say that to me it does not. It does most beautifully collate and represent to the mind the *conditions* of life, but life itself is a

thing too subtle to be so held; and, when we attempt so to hold it in mind, it escapes, and we have left only a definition that does not define; for the principle of affinity in the crystal is just as much an adjustment of inner relations to outer relations as is life. But as expressing the conditions under which life exists and without which it ceases to exist it is wonderful—and for the purpose of this argument that is all that is needed.

The argument goes to show that life and all its increments arising in the course of evolution appear in response to environments already prepared for them. "Step by step in the upward advance toward Humanity the environments have enlarged," and every increment in the enlargement and development of life and intelligence has had reference to actual existence or conditions outside of itself: "The eye was developed in response to the outward existence of light—the ear in response to the outward existence of acoustic vibrations; the mother's love came in response to the infant's needs; fidelity and honor were slowly developed as the nascent social life required them: everywhere the internal adjustment has been brought about so as to harmonize with some actually existing external fact. Such has been Nature's method—such is the deepest law of life that science has been able to discover."

At a critical moment in the history of humanity, love was beginning to play an important part; notions of right and wrong were germinating in the nascent human soul; the family was coming into existence; social ties were beginning to be formed and altruistic feelings to be evolved. At the same critical moment another psychic element came into view; another increment was added to life and intelligence—an increment that quickly raised humanity to a plane far and away above all the races which it had already outstripped in its forward and upward march. The idea of an Unseen World took possession of the human mind—of an Eternal Presence in that Unseen World, and of some relationship existing between itself and that invisible realm and its mysterious occupants. Here is a cardinal fact—the child-like mind of the still

child-like race was groping to put itself into relation with an ethical world not perceptible to its senses. It was the birth of the religious sentiment—a sentiment that has played a most important rôle in the subsequent evolution of human society.

The turning point of the argument is this: To suppose that during countless ages, from the seaweed up to man, the progress of life had been achieved, without a break, by adjustments of internal to external realities, and that then suddenly an attempt was made to adjust one of the most important of internal realities to an external non-reality, "is to do sheer violence to logic and to common sense." "And the analogies of Nature fairly shout against the assumption of such a breach of continuity between the evolution of man and all previous evolution." To suppose that this almost universal internal sentiment regarding an unseen world, a power represented under various forms as Deity, and an after life, is striving to adjust itself to a non-existent unseen world, Deity, and after life, is absurd.

This is a mere outline—perhaps an unsatisfactory one—of the book under consideration. It is a serious attempt at constructive religion upon truly scientific grounds. The religious element in man is a fact. The study of comparative religion shows how permanent this sentiment has been in humanity and how industriously it has labored to satisfy this sentiment by an adjustment to a corresponding external reality. Our author shows us that this sentiment is justified by science.

There are many books we like to read, and we then let them pass out of our hands without regret—we have secured the grain of wheat from the abundant chaff and have no further need of them; but this is one of the books that we want by us. It is in the line of the new religious thought that is so rapidly coming; in it science and religious thought meet on a higher plane than they have before been accustomed to occupy, and a noble plea for the religious sentiment in man is presented by a representation of the best scientific thought.

R. OSGOOD MASON.

New York.

FARMING IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

FARMING in the nineteenth century began in the age of cord-wood. It ran into the age of coal and steam—about 1840 to 1850. So far the steam age has lasted about fifty years. It has succeeded in that short time in transforming farm life and revolutionizing all life.

(1) It took away home industries. During the quiet age of cord-wood the farmer made nearly everything he used, from the clothes worn by his family to the soap and candles and carpets. He raised his own mutton, while his wife carded their own wool, spun their own rolls, wove their own yarn, and sewed their own clothes. A girl of ten had a home-made dress with tucks in it, and the tucks were let out each year as she grew taller. Boys were clothed in homespun linsey-woolsey. Steam took soap-making to one factory, candle-making to another, carding to a third, and weaving to a fourth. So it soon came about that the farmer must buy everything he used to manufacture, and he must manage to sell something to buy with. The age of barter passed into an age of trade. Home industries were narrowed down to digging and cheese and butter making. Then came the cheese factory, and the creamery. I do not say that farm life could not have been readjusted to the new age, but it could not have been done at once; and it really never has been done at all. Farm life became less attractive, and rural homes more dull and monotonous. This is the chief trouble to-day—that our farm home-life lacks the varied industries that it once included.

(2) The steam age built up great cities. Steam power cannot be carried far. It must run its spindles in close proximity. The factory, therefore, grew bigger and bigger. Factories and manufactories required shops and stores, and tended to agglomerize population. Our cities doubled and trebled; and with them grew not only business but misery, and not only wealth but poverty. To-day one-half the residents of cities

are dependent on fluctuations of business for a living. One-third of their people are paupers or criminals. Three generations, we are assured by statisticians, will run out a city's population if it be not steadily renewed from the country. The herding instinct, which had been decreasing, has of late increased in America. And it has been our farm boys and farm girls who have fed and still feed city life. They have left the farms as fast as possible for more attractive chances. Yet Abbott Lawrence tells us that "ninety business men out of a hundred fail once, eighty out of a hundred fail twice, and seventy out of a hundred fail three times." The attractions of business life are on the surface. A city is like a maelstrom for most who enter its circle of influence. We began in 1790 with ninety-six per cent. of agricultural population. This has gone on decreasing, decade by decade, till now we have less than forty per cent.

(3) The steam age massed wealth as it never had been massed—except in Rome, by the hand of war. These two powers alone, steam and war, have been able to pile up enormous fortunes in the hands of the few. A ton of coal stands for 1,300 horses, for a day of ten hours; but a factory will consume one hundred tons a day—equal to using up 130,000 horse power. Vanderbilt's engines use 10,000 tons a day; that is, Mr. Vanderbilt every day drives thirteen millions of horses. Says Prof. Orton: "Never before has such extreme inequality prevailed in the distribution of wealth as in this country. The individual fortunes of our day, mainly gathered in the last forty years, overtop all that have been known before and render the standards of comparison which the world has used for the last two thousand years ridiculously inadequate." And this living for accumulation has touched farm life. Our homes are run largely on the speculative spirit. Crops are raised to get rich on, at the expense of crops to get comfort out of. But farming has not been able to compete with manufactures and commerce. They have the steam: the farm has not. Farmers will always in the steam age be the relatively poorer class.

(4) The steam age has legislated for commerce and manufactures in preference to agriculture; that is, the laws have been made by steam. It would be strange if a man that drives thirteen millions of horses didn't drive faster than a man with one horse, or with a two-horse team. Protection has been demanded and secured for the factories, which do what we used to do in our homes without asking for protection. As an employment apart from others, agriculture has demanded and required very little of the time of Congress. Nor is there the least hope that the increased legislation demanded by farmers will be of much advantage. Laws lie about us as thick as leaves in the woods, and nobody knows one-tenth of the annual output. Is it any wonder that a class is growing among us that denounces all laws, and is ready to smash the whole machine of government? Farmers are not interested in selfish legislation, but in stopping class legislation of any sort they are deeply concerned.

(5) The worst of it all is that, while steam and coal have transformed everything else, they have left our *education* almost exactly what it was. If we send our boys and girls to school they ought to be taught what will make farm life intelligent, interesting, and successful. What we need to know and have known on our land, for successful agriculture, is chemistry—a knowledge of soils, manures, grains, waters; botany—plant-growth, plant-food, plant-habits; zoology—knowledge of animal life and animal structure. But what common school gives these things? It would amaze our school boards beyond measure to have such things displace dear old geography—with a large amount of grocery and store knowledge. "Surely," says Prof. Teegan, "the teaching of practical school-gardening would be as valuable as setting the pupils to memorize the height of the principal peaks of the Rocky Mountains." But are not these sciences too abstruse and difficult? Can we get the pupils to comprehend them, or get teachers qualified to instruct? Chemistry and botany are knowledge of the things children see and handle most. In their elementary form they are more simple than geography

or grammar or arithmetic. Such sciences consider stones, flowers, trees, insects, birds, brooks—exactly what our children long to study. As for teachers, what are our normal schools for? To make merchants? or farmers? Or are they to turn the whole population into middlemen and consumers? Why can they not furnish teachers of geology as easily as teachers of geography? Give a boy a right sort of schooling till fifteen, and you cannot coax him away from the *land*. Everything he sees or touches or hears is full of delight and interest. "Rural education," says U. S. Commissioner of Education William T. Harris, "is now the greatest of all our national interests—and it is colossal." But he does not say that the trouble with which we have to deal is not too little education, but too little of the right sort.

It is very probable that the age of coal and steam is near its close. The English Parliament has appointed two commissions to determine how long English coal would endure. The conclusion is that it will not last much beyond one hundred years longer; but it will not endure the increased draft of progress one-half that time. Professor Orton, the ablest authority on American coal, tells us that all known deposits in this country, with the exception of the Pittsburg seam, will be practically exhausted for keeping up with increased demands by the middle of the present century. The territory that holds coal deposits is pretty well known and measured. There are about 400,000 square miles of the earth's surface known to be carboniferous. Estimates cannot be exact, but they are not far astray. The coal famine of Europe has begun already, and the draft on American coal enormously increased. We are rushing by steam toward the end of the steam age. It has been a fierce, furious age, full of tremendous struggle of man with Nature—and man has been victorious. The enormous task of girding the world with steel has been accomplished. We have sounded the depths of the oceans, dropped cables under their mountains of waters, and have made neighbors of all mankind. Can we conceive of an age less plunging, less turbulent, less cyclonic; an age in which we gather up

our achievements, and turn our minds to make all men happy rather than a few wealthy; an age of culture, of peace, of love? At any rate there are signs that the work of steam is waning. It no longer pays to build railroads. Very few have been built for the last ten years. The network is woven. The railroad comes about as near our farms as we can expect. It still costs the farmer more to get his produce to the depots than it does to have the same produce carried to New York or Boston.

We have no quarrel with the railroad age. It was necessary, for fifty years, to subsidize the world to get these marvelous iron roads. But now the want is (1) better dirt roads, and (2) a different power from steam. The government granted favors and gave our public lands to railroad corporations; now the united force of the American people must create solid roads for short haulage. Europe is ahead of us; all the civilized world is ahead of us. We have for common roads only such as were used in colonial days. The loss from their use in New York State alone is annually, from haulage of a single crop, not less than ten millions—besides loss in taking prompt advantage of markets; loss in vehicles, harness, and animals; loss in comfort, health, and decency—while our annual road tax is almost absolute waste. The twentieth century will surely see the bog-road system abrogated. It will see the American farmer moving as smoothly as the middlemen move on their steel rails, or merchants on their Telford pavement. It will cost us five dollars an acre from ocean to ocean to get such roads; but it will add twenty dollars or more of inherent value to each acre, and ten dollars to the salable value. But, aside from pecuniary considerations, we want agriculture lifted out of the mud. We want the same grade of comfort everywhere that is possessed by the cities.

The second great need of the farmer is, as already said, a new power in place of steam—a power that can be specifically adjusted to farm wants. Electricity is possibly just that power. In the first place, electricity can be carried a long distance from the plant. You cannot profitably carry steam

one-quarter of a mile; you may carry electricity ten miles, or a hundred. Steam concentrates labor, and therefore population. Electricity distributes force, and therefore population. The electric age will put an end to the packing of people like sardines in tenement-houses. It will take the people to the food, instead of carrying all the food to the people. Instead of factories, home life will be emphasized. Work will not need to be done so exclusively at great centers. The miseries of gorged streets and the problems of municipal misrule will steadily lessen. But electricity will do more. Already in the prairie States they are building short-haulage roads, to drag farmers' wagons direct from the door to the market. We will soon see all over America strings of farm wagons moving as we now see long trains of freight-cars. Power will be taken from the same plants to run barn and house machinery, and to heat and light houses—possibly to do much more than that.

Farming will have not only the roads and the new power: it will have the schools. I will picture what I believe to be the common school of the twentieth century. There will be handsome schoolhouses in abundance, placed in the center of large gardens. The children will study books half a day, and things the other half. The brain will not get any more training than the hands. Manual culture, which is already a part of the school life of a few towns, will be a part of school life everywhere. The school will have its shops and its gardens—and to use tools will be the chief end of culture. Man got away from the monkey by his power to make and use tools. He goes back to the ape when his hands have to be cased in gloves and his brain is ashamed of decent labor. In these school-gardens botany will be applied to horticulture. In the shops our boys and girls will learn to create things. The trouble with education now is that it divorces knowledge from work—the brains from the hands. I asked a college boy the other day what he intended to do when he graduated. "Well," he said, "I've thought of everything under the sun, and I don't believe I could succeed at anything. I guess I'll have to teach."

In the twentieth century the glory of American education will also be a thorough knowledge of economics, civics, and history, applied to good citizenship. Colleges will surely be a part of the common-school system, and just as full of modern life. I believe we shall see the days when boys and girls who are in our common schools together, without damage, can be coëducated in all other grades of school life. The farmer will then not have a separate and specific college for agriculture, while the rest have one for "mental culture"; nor will college boys in those days be ashamed to look ahead to farming as a profession. There is no occupation that requires as much wit and educated tact, and as much positive knowledge, as farming. When we get the schools, we shall get a style of farming that will be as keenly intellectual as our present style is wasteful and unintelligent.

Having won the new power and the schools, agriculture will control the laws also. Tariffs, if they exist at all, will protect production as much as they protect traffic; they will encourage the farmer as well as the hired laborer. I think that by and by we shall be able as agriculturists to understand that the steam age has been naturally and needfully in the interest of manufacturers and traders. Jefferson insisted that the future of the Republic depended on agriculture—that the great aim of the people should be to develop land-culture. The best way to develop agriculture is through equality. What we need is to obliterate half the laws rather than to make more. Every sun that shines on America sees about one hundred new statutes enacted, on an average. It has become a passion with us to legislate. Our legislatures will probably hereafter meet less often, while all laws of general importance will possibly be referred back to the people to be confirmed or vetoed.

Our homes will never again be of the old industrial type. We must adjust ourselves to the new days and new things. With proper agricultural schooling we shall learn to adopt diversified crops, instead of speculating or venturing on one or two. Our houses will be, like our schools, made up of more shop and garden life. There is no reason why every home

shall not have laboratories and museums as well as libraries. Along our homes will be, not only good public driveways, but ornamental roadsides. A rural district in Michigan took the initiative in another way. A telegraph line of eight miles was provided, connecting a large number of farms with the post-office and depot and general store, so that each farm was brought into immediate relation with every important interest of the town. If a farmer expected an important letter he could wait till notified of its arrival. The total cash expenditure for the outfit in this case was \$200.

This experiment was in the eighties. Since that time we have seen a revolution that has reversed nearly every phase of farm life. Independent telephone companies are constructing lines that connect farm houses in social and economic routes. These already number many thousands, and are irregularly spread over New England, New York, and the mid-West as well as the Pacific States. The idea is spreading so rapidly that the number of 'phones placed in country houses is said to have doubled in 1899. The cost to the farmer is from ten to fifteen dollars a year, including rental and supervision of the lines and instruments by the company or contractor. In a few cases the lines and the instruments are owned by the farmers themselves. The social consequences are so great as at first to overshadow the economic. Farm isolation, which has been the chief drawback of agriculture, is abolished. The remote farm-house is brought within speaking distance of a dozen neighbors, and in all probability a village or town. Long-distance routes are easily formed. The farm wife hears the cheery good-morning of her neighbors and gives it in return. Friendly gossip and the news are transmitted as easily as over the fences of city lots. Telephone tea-parties are said to be in vogue—while the women of a circuit sit by their 'phones, drink their own tea, nibble their own cakes, and distribute the gossip. Music is as easily transmitted as conversation. Phonographic concerts are a common affair. The writer has heard the fiddle, the parlor organ, and the piano at a distance of a mile. A circuit generally con-

sists of about one dozen houses; but two or more of these circuits can be connected, and altogether have a long-distance connection with the general telephone service of the United States. In Ohio a minister has his whole parish wired to his church. There is really no reason why the country parish shall not be served by the ablest preachers in the land. But the economic consequences are still more important. The farmer can now buy and sell to customers in remote towns—himself not leaving his home. He consults prices by 'phone, so that speculators cannot readily outreach him. He is brought within conversational distance of the great markets. On every one of these circuits or groups of circuits is sure to be a physician, and probably a grocer.

It is rapidly becoming possible for a physician to live far away from any town and yet have a large clientage. The tendency is to take away the importance of city residence and even of that old-fashioned grouping called the village, which was originally only a collection of houses of laborers around the villa. The drift to congested towns is reversed. Population is spreading out. The increased uses of electricity as a motive power combine with the telephone thus to spread out and equalize the distribution of population. Nor is even this the end of the evolution. A new era has begun in social grouping. We are beginning to hear that this or that family belongs to a certain circuit. The social unit is no longer the town. The farmer of the twentieth century will be known not by the village nearest to his land, or by the city to which he carries his products, but he will be known by his 'phone connections; that is, Farmer Smith will be 'phone 10, in circuit 5, in County X.

The source of power for the establishment of plants will be waterfalls, tides, and windmills. Storage batteries will collect the current on windy days from the million windmills in the United States to be used when and where needed. A whole State can be supplied with half a dozen plants. The problem of supply involves no serious difficulty.

But we must not fail to look indoors. When electricity

enters our households to do a very large share of our kitchen work, another problem will be hurried toward solution. The most serious question now affecting American life, after that of waste, is help. We are just now in the terrifying crisis. It is growing more and more difficult to secure for our households competent assistance, while the need of good help is greatly increased. It is impossible to build the ideal home simply because we must as a rule admit freely into our houses persons bred in vulgarity, or our wives must do work that stands in the way of higher work, culture, rest, and enjoyment. The advent of a power that can wash our dishes, wash our clothes, do our cooking, churning, sewing, and that without noise or dirt, is to be hailed with acclamations of joy. There is no doubt that we are approaching an entirely new age of homebuilding and housekeeping. Electricity will help us to get rid of the invasion of our homes by a purely menial class. At the same time let us not forget that this menial class will be itself helped to escape from a subject position by the same new power. Smaller homes will be brighter, cheerier, cleaner, and warmer, as well as less expensive. Coal bills and oil or gas bills will be abolished. Fuel and light will be so lessened in cost as to be practically, like education, free.

Those who attended the Columbian Exhibition will remember with special delight the quality of certain foods offered freely to the passing crowds, and that were cooked in ovens where the only power used was a current of electricity. But equally delightful to remember is the fact that, as electricity abolishes superfluous heat and dirt and waste of fuel, it introduces the beautiful. The electric fountains—who will ever forget them? Decorative lighting of our houses and lawns will produce effects beyond our imagination at present to picture. So the useful and the ornamental blend—unite to make our lives better worth living. Word comes that electricity is to be applied to the working of factories in Germany and of dairies in England. Two Belgian scientists have recently patented a method of heating, melting, and refining metals by electricity.

What is to follow this discovery it would be difficult to foresee. But the marvel is that while our professors are saying what is impossible, or pointing out limitations, the impossibles are swept away. The construction company for utilizing Niagara tells us that every step of their way was hindered by new and often astounding discoveries or inventions. They had to go over their work again and again to pick up and incorporate these new discoveries.

There is, however, no outlook more pleasant for us than the effect that will be produced in the way of sanitation and health. When our homes are heated by electricity, says a noted writer, "consumption and many other diseases will wholly disappear—not in a day or a single year, but as certainly as yellow fever disappears before a frost. Its uses in the household will be to ventilate it by means of fans, to supply power for pumps, sewing-machines, dumb-waiters, elevators, bells, and cooking apparatus." The idea is not abstruse, nor is it visionary. The removal of stoves and furnaces and gas-pipes, and attendant dust and bad air, will easily revolutionize the sanitary conditions under which we live. Our heating and lighting appliances of the steam age are positive elements of danger. It is almost impossible so to conduct our homes as to avoid unsanitary conditions from coal, steam, and gas. Our worst diseases most prevail in winter months—when our houses are most closed.

One hundred years ago Burke said that America could never be represented in Parliament: "Some of their provinces will receive writs of election in six weeks, some in ten. After election, if ships are promptly ready, it will take them six weeks more to reach London. Meanwhile Parliament has far, far advanced its business—nay, perhaps been dissolved. So that before their arrival they are themselves discharged of duty, and the writs issued are on the way for their successors." This was the age of wind power. Then came steam power, which shortened the passage of the Atlantic from six weeks to six days. Electricity may do even greater wonders than this; yet as a power it belongs not to commerce, but to agri-

culture. It is not so much the power that links nations as the power that links farm to farm; that does what, after all, steam cannot do—move in all directions: up hill, or down hill, and across lots. Mr. Frank Hawley tells us that the railroads of the country are only waiting for improved accumulators to substitute electricity for steam. And he is confident the change will soon be made.

E. P. POWELL.

Clinton, N. Y.

A CIVIC LEADER OF THE NEW TIME.

I.

THE old apostolic spirit is again abroad among our people—that spirit which made primitive Christianity so great a moral power that, but for the corruption and fall of the Church when overtaken by worldly ambition she sought union with a State pagan to the heart's core, would have soon transformed the world; that spirit which made the Reformation so mighty a moral force ere its adherents took up the sword; that spirit which fired our patriotic fathers and made the American Revolution invincible in spite of the fact that a pitiful handful of poorly armed and scantily clothed patriots were pitted against one of the mightiest powers of the world. Now, whenever this vital moral influence becomes active in a nation a great upward and onward step is sure to follow.

The history of civilization is a struggle toward the light. It is a toilsome struggle marked from time to time by the retrogression of peoples through the failure to be true to their high mission. If there is any truth that the past makes very plain it is that if in the age-long struggle of the people against injustice and oppression a nation or civilization allows its attention to be diverted even in moments of great peril from without, traitors enter the temple of freedom only to betray; while that people which permits itself to slumber under the pleasing delusion that its freedom is secure will surely awaken to find itself bound hand and foot and the Philistines upon it. This is much the condition of the American people to-day. There can be no denying the fact that the reactionary element is entrenched in municipal, State, and national life; and the forces that are seeking to form the most dangerous and oppressive kind of despotism are becoming as arrogant as was Belshazzar when the Medes and Persians were secretly draining the Euphrates, and as confident as was Xerxes on the eve of the battle of Salamis. And yet, while I would in no wise minimize the great evils that so seriously menace free institutions,

I am far from being discouraged, because the schoolmaster has been too long abroad in the land; and when the giant who lives and breathes in millions of homes, and whom we call the people, awakens, he will not be the ignorant, craven serf of other ages. Moreover, the oppression is bearing on almost every class, while above and beyond this is the moral awakening that, though not heralded in the sensational press or proclaimed from the street-corners, is nation-wide in its extent.

He who is in touch with the undercurrent of society knows full well that there are everywhere indications in the gathering together of forces dedicated to social righteousness such as have rarely been seen in our era. The spirit of Thermopylae lives in many times three hundred Americans, and the life and teachings of the great Nazarene are being felt in the soul and are quickening the spiritual energies of tens of thousands of our people, as they have moved and stirred the imagination of man only in crucial moments in history—when the spirit of progress and civilization has nerved itself for a supreme stand against some deadly evil or a giant wrong.

To-day throughout the Republic—in cities, towns, villages, and hamlets—there are young men and women stepping out of the ranks of slothful conventionalism and devoting all that is best and finest in their natures to the service of progress. I doubt if in the last forty years there has been a time when anything like the same number of young Americans have been silently and unostentatiously, but intelligently, seeking to further the principle of the Golden Rule as are at the present. True, they are as yet working at a disadvantage owing to the fact that they are not organized and therefore not in touch with one another; but the fact that they are laboring for social righteousness, and are ready to make great sacrifices to hasten the day of better things, promises well for the near future.

Nor is this all. We have with us to-day many fine scholars in the early flush of manhood's prime who are voluntarily turning their backs on position, wealth, and worldly fame that they may aid in furthering the cause of justice. The lives of these men, like the examples and teachings of the true prophets

of other days, are an inspiration to all who come under their influence, and it is our purpose from time to time to notice some of these young Americans who represent in so large a way the ideal of what twentieth-century manhood should be, believing that the story of their lives will encourage and stimulate other young men and women; for we are all influenced by the ideals and mental images held before our minds. This is true of nations, not less than of individuals. Who imagines that we would to-day behold the spectacle of our Republic engaged in a war of criminal aggression if during the last generation the public mind had been centered on the lives and teachings of Washington, Jefferson, Lafayette, Cobden, Bright, Gladstone, and Mazzini, instead of having been engrossed as it has been by the consideration of the multitudinous biographies and laudatory sketches of Napoleon, Cæsar, Cromwell, and Alexander?

II.

In opening these papers dealing with twentieth-century manhood, I desire to notice briefly the life and writings of Ernest Howard Crosby, as in him we have a fine representative of the new moral leadership which is appearing, and which in the name of justice and freedom dares to break lance with Church, State, and society, when they stand for intolerance, injustice, greed, and aught else that tends to corrupt manhood or work injury to the weak.

Mr. Crosby is one of the comparatively few college men of our time whose education has been well rounded. As a rule our young men are trained intellectually, while the moral sensibilities are either neglected or made subservient to mental development; and as a result we find all professions filled with trucklers and time-servers—men that substitute expediency for right or duty as the governing factor in life. This is the fatal flaw in our educational system, for which school, church, and family are all measurably to blame, and which to-day more than aught else retards enduring progress.

Mr. Crosby from his earliest childhood was taught the supremely important lesson that a sacred responsibility rested

with him; that his duty to humanity was such that, unless he consecrated life's best gifts to the service of civilization, he would be recreant to his trust. Such was the lesson that he learned at the fireside of his father's home, where culture, refinement, and loving concern for others were ever present. The home influence was directed toward bringing out the finest elements in the child's nature. Here the youth imbibed that sturdy morality and reverence for duty so essential to leadership in conflicts of right against might.

He was prepared for college in the Mohegan Lake School, and thence entered the University of the City of New York, from which institution he was graduated in 1876. In 1878 he was graduated from the Columbia College Law School, after which he practised his profession for several years. In the years 1887-8-9 he was a member of the New York State Legislature, during the last year of which he served with distinction as chairman of the most important committee of the Assembly—that on the Cities.

In 1889 he received the appointment from President Harrison as Judge of the International Tribunal at Alexandria, Egypt—a nomination that was ratified by the Khedive. The position of judge in Egypt is virtually a life office, but the brilliant young jurist and statesman who thus far had steadily risen in the political world suddenly realized that he was at war with himself. The modern spirit of materialistic commercialism had taken him to the mountain's height; the prospect was pleasing; all that was necessary was for him to fall down and worship the tempter—that is, to conform to the prevailing low ideals, to close his ear to the cry of justice, his eye to the misery of the poor and the unfortunate, and to steel his conscience against the warning voice of duty. But this was precisely that which the best in his nature recoiled from, and, fortunately for the cause of progress, about this time some of Count Tolstoy's works came into his hands. One, called "Life," proved a trumpet call to the wavering soul. In an hour the choice was made. He threw his lot with the minority to whom the voice of duty is divine. He resigned his position

in 1894, and on his way home visited Count Tolstoy at the latter's home at Yasnaia Poliana. Since his return he has worked unceasingly for social progress. He was the first president of the Social Reform Club and was recently elected to the important position of president of the Civic Council of New York, a body of social reformers representing more than one hundred organizations, formed for the purpose of turning the light on the dark places where corruption, injustice, and oppression hold sway, and of educating the public conscience on questions that bear most intimately on social conditions in municipal life. Mr. Crosby is also president of the New York Anti-Imperialistic League. He is an uncompromising foe of war and has done valiant service in combating the brutal spirit that has been rampant in the Republic during the last few years. In this field of missionary work some of his best efforts have been put forth to arouse the Church from its moral lethargy. In a notable protest against the action of the Church in upholding war, made before the Episcopal Church Congress in Providence, R. I., on November 15, 1900, Mr. Crosby said:

"War is hell, as General Sherman long ago told us; but he did not go on to tell us why. There is only one possible reason. Hell is not a geographical term; it is merely the expression of the spiritual condition of its inhabitants. War is hell because it transforms men into devils. . . . War is hate. Christianity is love. On which side should the Church be ranged? War is hell. The Church is, or ought to be, the Kingdom of Heaven. What possible truce can there be between them? And yet it is a fact that the Church favors war. Can you recall a single sermon condemning war, or even severely critical of it?

"A great movement against war has been going on in England during the last two years. I find among its leaders Frederick Harrison, the positivist, Herbert Spencer, the agnostic, and John Morley, the atheist, but the whole bench of bishops has been on the side of bloodshed. In France the Church has given its unanimous support to the military conspiracy against Dreyfus, and left it to the free-thinking Zola to show 'what Jesus would do.' In Germany and Russia the Church is the mainstay of military despotism. Is it true that things are so very different in this country? . . .

"Is it strange, then, that outsiders should criticize us? A

Japanese writer, Matsumura Kaiseki, uses this language in a recent article: 'To the Oriental Christian there seems to be something absolutely contradictory in the gospel preached by the missionaries and the action of their governments.' And the eminent Jew, Max Nordau, is surprised to find that 'the Church does not seem to see that it is blasphemy to ask of the God of love to look with favor upon murder and destruction.' May we not have something to learn from Jew and Gentile?

"This backwardness of the Church to do the work of Christ, while those beyond the pale are endeavoring to accomplish it, has a precise analogy in the history of the anti-slavery movement. It was such 'infidels' as Garrison and Phillips that were fulfilling the obligations of the Church fifty years ago, while she was searching the Scriptures to find authority for a sin which the world had outgrown. War is going to be condemned by the conscience of the world just as surely as slavery was condemned. I do not say that wars will cease. Murder and theft have not ceased, though they are condemned by mankind. But I do say that war will be adjudged a crime, like other murders and robberies, and that those who take part in it will know that they are doing wrong. The only question is, What instrument will God use in bringing this about? Shall we allow him to use the Church, or shall we ask him to look for other agents? It is because I believe the Church may still be persuaded to volunteer for this great task that I am here to-night. . . .

"We condemn arson, adultery, murder, burglary, lying, and theft. War includes them all, and in a form more exaggerated, more self-evidently wrong, than any one of them taken alone. War repeals the Ten Commandments and explicitly places a portion of the human race outside the universal obligation of Christian love.

"Every age has had its barbarisms. We wonder now at slavery, at the hanging of boys for stealing a shilling, at imprisonment for debt, at the torture of witnesses, at the rack and thumbscrew and stake. All these things were supported by Christians and the Church. Are we to suppose that our age is the first without sanctified barbarisms? And if not, what barbarism of the day is so conspicuous as war? No, it is an awful hallucination, a fatal delusion, that war can be Christian. Let us fill our hearts with love and look forth upon our enemies, if we have enemies, with that love, and we shall see clearly that a Christian war is as impossible as a Christian murder."

At the present time the Church, not less than the State, inclines to the wholly vicious and immoral doctrine that it is right to do evil that good may come. You cannot, as Mr. Crosby well says, "love men with bombshells," and the Christian church that, under whatsoever pretext, justifies or upholds a war of subjugation against a people struggling for freedom has betrayed its founder and reputed leader, and has crucified him afresh by giving the lie to his most solemn teachings and injunctions and to the spirit of his gospel.

In the crusade for social righteousness and individual development Mr. Crosby has been as brave, outspoken, and earnest as in his warfare against war. He has been no sign-board, pointing up the rugged path of progress while remaining stationary in the green valley below. On the contrary, he has shown his faith by the sacrifices he has cheerfully made and by his work in behalf of the weak and the oppressed. Hence his writings, while affording an excellent key to the life of the man, possess a value not present in the utterances of the "sleek, comfortable, and prudent" opportunist, who, while saying many good things, fashions his life primarily with a view to ease and self-comfort.

In Mr. Crosby's unique work, "Plain Talk in Psalm and Parable," we have a bold, consistent, but thoroughly unconventional volume, full of the spirit of that One who scourged the money-changers from the temple; who said to the erring woman, "Neither do I condemn thee; go, and sin no more"; and who on the cross cried, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" It is in the truest sense a book of the new time, which throughout reflects the spirit of the coming manhood that shall transform civilization. The volume opens with these fine lines addressed to the high-minded and austere prophet of progress in Russia, whose life has been a veritable beacon to those working for freedom for all through love:

Hail, Tolstoy, bold, archaic shape,
Rude pattern of the man to be,
From 'neath whose rugged traits escape
Hints of a manhood fair and free.

I read a meaning in your face,
A message wafted from above,
Prophetic of an equal race
Fused into one by robust love.

Like some quaint statue long concealed.
Deep buried in Mycenæ's mart,
Wherein we clearly see revealed
The promise of Hellenic art,

So stand you; while aloof and proud,
The world that scribbles, prates, and frets
Seems but a simpering, futile crowd
Of Dresden china statuettes.

Like John the Baptist, once more scan
The signs that mark the dawn of day.
Forerunner of the Perfect Man,
Make straight His path, prepare the way.

The desert too is your abode,
Your garb and fare of little worth;
Thus ever has the Spirit showed
The coming reign of heaven on earth.

Not in kings' houses may we greet
The prophets whom the world shall bless;
To lay my verses at your feet
I seek you in the wilderness.

The rugged simplicity and directness characteristic of "Plain Talk" are in bold and refreshing contrast to the trimming and time-serving spirit which at the present time is on all sides seeking to curry favor with the powerful and avoid the possibility of offending the modern, emasculated, dilettante critic. The ethical spirit is that of the prophet, who refuses to speak smooth things when injustice, ignorance, and crime are everywhere masquerading under the mantle of probity, law, and respectability. Nothing has been more painfully evident during the last two or three decades than the prostitution of government at the instigation and through the powerful and oftentimes thoroughly corrupt agencies of special privileges and class-protected interests. The rich heritage of the people has been shamelessly given away to predatory bands who are being annually enriched by millions upon millions of dollars that should justly be pouring into the city, State, and national treasuries, but which now, apart from the amount used in debauching public opinion and corrupting public servants, are going to swell the abnormal wealth of a few scores of indi-

viduals. This notorious fact is admirably stated by our author in the following lines, entitled "The State-House":

Up to the State-House wend their way
Some score of thieves elect;
For one great recompense they pray:
"May we grow rich from day to day,
Although the State be wrecked."

Up to the State-House climb with stealth
Another pilgrim band,—
The thieves who have acquired their wealth,
And, careless of their country's health,
Now bleed their native land.

And soon the yearly sale is made
Of privilege and law;
The poor thieves by the rich are paid
Across the counter, and a trade
More brisk you never saw.

And we, whose rights are bought and sold.
With reason curse and swear;
Such acts are frightful to behold,
Nor has the truth been ever told
Of half the evil there.

At last the worthless set adjourn;
We sigh with deep relief.
Then from the statute-book we learn
The record of each theft in turn,
The bills of every thief.

Now at a shameful scene pray look;
For we who cursed and swore,
Before this base-born statute-book,
Whose poisoned source we ne'er mistook,
Both worship and adore.

"For law is law," we loud assert,
And think ourselves astute;
Yet quite forgetful, to our hurt,
That fraud is fraud and dirt is dirt,
And like must be their fruit.

We laugh at heathen who revere
The gods they make of stone,
And yet we never ask, I fear,
As we bow down from year to year,
How we have made our own.

We all deny the right of kings
To speak for their Creator;
May we not wonder, then, whence springs
The right divine to order things
Of any legislator?

Many of the psalms are highly suggestive. What is implied but left unsaid is quite as helpful and important as what is uttered. This fact is illustrated in the following lines, entitled "Not the Lord":

I.

Praise ye the Lord,
For he hath given to his poor a world stored with all riches:
Stone in the mountain, brick in the field, timber in the forest to build
them their houses;
Wool and cotton to make them clothing;
Corn and fruit and every manner of plant for their food.
Who hath shut them out from the fullest enjoyment of all these things
which they themselves produce?
It is not God. Praise ye the Lord.

II.

Praise ye the Lord,
For he hath given to his poor brains, and eyes and ears of the best,
So that they might know the beauty of the landscape,
So that they might acknowledge the sway of the old masters of art.
And feel the thrill of the noblest music,
And take to their bosom the greatest poets,
And love their books as themselves.
Who hath shut them out from all this fruition?
It is not God. Praise ye the Lord.

III.

Praise ye the Lord,
For he hath given to his poor hearts to love their fellows,
So that they might have the key to the kingdom of heaven.
Who is it that taketh away the key and shutteth up the kingdom
against them?
That neither goeth in himself nor suffereth them that are entering to
go in?
It is not God. Praise ye the Lord.

How many of us go through life worshipping at the shrine of the past or sighing for the golden age to come, heeding not the eternal now, which the philosopher has characterized as "a king in disguise!" In the following lines, entitled "Prophet,

Priest, and King," Mr. Crosby emphasizes this thought in a simple and impressive way:

"Man is one. All ages are bound together.

The *is* grew out of the *was* and in turn becomes the *will be*.

We all travel the same road, in the same caravan; some before, some behind;

The prophet in the van linking us to the religion of the future,

The priest in the rear linking us to the religion of the past.

We trudge on between, looking forward or backward,

But forgetful, most of us, of the real religion of above;

Blind to the eternal now, in which priest and prophet are at one together, united in the present king.

And where old types and symbols tally with the newest dreams."

Victor Hugo, in a brilliant criticism of genius and art entitled "William Shakespeare," observes that: "We live in a time when the orators are heard praising the magnanimity of white bears and the tender feelings of panthers." He discerned a tendency, which has rapidly grown in recent years, of praising, or at least condoning, glaring wrongs, injustice, oppression, and corruption, when they bear the seductive label of success. The tyrant who usurps a place of power is surrounded by fawning sycophants. The weak ruler who allows vicious men to shape his policy is excused when not held up to the young for emulation. The corrupt but rich financier, who through the aid of special privilege and by means of indirection and injustice has crushed out competing rivals and silenced opposition, is fulsomely praised in goody-goody publications as a type of success, and young men are admonished to emulate him; while all those who seek to wrench apart the rivets that shackle man, or who strive to broaden the vision of the age and to brighten the common life, are belittled when they are not denounced as demagogues and dangerous characters. Breathing the spirit of revolt against such moral poison, Victor Hugo in another place thus boldly speaks with prophetic voice as to the real needs of the hour:

"Help from the strong for the weak, help from the great for the small, help from the free for the slaves, help from the thinkers for the ignorant, help from the solitary for the multitudes;—such is the law. . . Indignation and com-

passion for the mournful slavery of man are but two sides of the same faculty; those who are capable of wrath are capable of love. To level the tyrant and the slave—what a magnificent endeavor! Now the whole of one side of actual society is tyrant, and all the other side is slave. A grim settlement is impending, and it will be accomplished. All thinkers must work with that end in view. They will gain greatness in that work. To be the servant of God in the task of progress, and the apostle of God to the people—such is the law which regulates the growth of genius."

Many of Mr. Crosby's psalms show that he also fully realizes the duty of the true thinker to stand for the cause, even though he stand alone, to refuse to kneel to injustice or corruption, though a dukedom were to be won by such degradation. Hence, he shocks easy-going conventionalism by this apostrophe to "Revolt":

I.

Hail, spirit of revolt, thou spirit of life,
Child of the ideal, daughter of the far-away truth!
Without thee the nations drag on in a living death;
Without thee is stagnation and arrested growth;
Without thee Europe and America would be sunk in China's lethargy,
Smothered in the past, having no horizon but the actual.

II.

Hail, spirit of revolt, thou spirit of life,
Child of eternal love,—
Love rebelling against lovelessness, life rebelling against death!
Rise at last to the full measure of thy birthright;
Spurn the puny weapons of hate and oppression;
Fix rather thy calm, burning, protesting eyes on all the myriad shams
of man, and they will fade away in the thinnest air;
Gaze upon thy gainsayers until they see and feel the truth and love
that begat and bore thee.
Thus and thus only give form and body to thy noblest inspirations,
And we shall see done on earth as it is in heaven
God's ever living, growing, ripening will.

In keeping with this spirit are two excellent poems, much too long to quote—one entitled "The Prison," and the other "William Lloyd Garrison."

Here are some stanzas for the present time, bearing a message of wisdom and truth, which, if not heeded, will be sooner

or later impressed most terribly upon the nation to whom has been given the high and divine charge of leading the forces of light, liberty, peace, and progress. They are entitled "Song of the New Freedom":

Americans, ye once were free,
Your country led the nations' van,
Proclaiming new-born liberty,
The lost self-sovereignty of man.
All Europe then was glad
To follow in your train.
The glory that ye had
Would ye once more regain?
Then know, ye trust your arms in vain.

In vain ye build your battle-ships,
In vain ye fortify the coast;
Still many an armament outstrips
The devilish frenzy of your boast.
Think not to lead by force.
Ever have men relied
In vain on such a course.
Be free and far and wide;
The world will rally to your side.

Be free. Ye brag of freedom yet;
But do ye not, while glorying, feel
The tightening bonds? Can ye forget
The fetters dragging at your heel?
Each battle Freedom wins
Transforms her foe of old.
Another strife begins;
A tyrant new behold—
The sullen, swinish god of gold. . . .

Your heart is ruled by love of pelf;
Your land is ruled by pelf amassed.
Cast down the former; free yourself,
And soon you'll bind the latter fast.
Hark to our country's call,
And let us all unite;
The tyrant soon will fall.
Yea, as our cause is right,
Freedom again shall gain the fight!

In a poem addressed to England we have the following stanzas, which are to-day quite as applicable to our own land as to the mother country:

Call back home your wandering sons
With their Testaments and guns.
Whither are their footsteps bent?
Here they might have found content.

Here they have at their own price
The making of a paradise.
Nowhere will they find a stage
So fitted for the Golden Age.

There are more than a hundred psalms and parables in this work. Many of them are very beautiful; others are rich in practical hints and lessons; occasionally the prophet becomes a stern accuser, and we are reminded of Isaiah or Savonarola; but for the most part the spirit of gentleness is present. Perhaps the character of the book is nowhere so well typified as in the following poem, entitled "The State," in which the barbarism of the present is placed in bold antithesis with the higher and truer civilization that waits on the work of such earnest men as Ernest Crosby and other leaders of the oncoming social and economic revolution:

I.

They talked much of the State—the State.

I had never seen the State, and I asked them to picture it to me, as
my gross mind could not follow their subtle language when they
spoke of it.

Then they told me to think of it as a beautiful goddess, enthroned and
sceptered, benignly caring for her children.

But for some reason I was not satisfied.

And once upon a time, as I was lying awake at night and thinking,
I had as it were a vision,

And I seemed to see a barren ridge of sand beneath a lurid sky;
And lo, against the sky stood out in bold relief a black scaffold and
gallows-tree, and from the end of its gaunt arm hung, limp and
motionless, a shadowy, empty noose.

And a Voice whispered in my ear, "Behold the State incarnate!"
And as I looked aghast, the desert became thickly peopled, and all the
countless throngs did obeisance to the gibbet;

And they that were clad in rich raiment bowed down the lowest of all.

II.

The sheriff is reading his warrant to the condemned man in his cell.
He stammers and hesitates, and his voice is husky.

The executioner takes off his victim's collar and unbuttons his shirt, while the unhappy man smoothes down his new black coat with twitching fingers, and watches the sheriff's fat hands, and wonders whether he can get his gold ring off his little finger or not. Now his hands are tied behind him, and the procession moves.

There is the doctor, the soldier of life, turned deserter, and serving in the army of death.

There is the priest, holding out hopes, in an undertone, of another world, where the inhabitants are less inhuman than in this.

There are the correspondents of the press, eager for any news that will sell.

The majesty of the law leads and brings up the rear—the sheriff and his deputies, the attorneys and the police.

All that is respected in the community is represented here.

They have congregated like vultures scenting carrion from afar.

The doomed man has braced himself up for a supreme effort, but his knees are unsteady, his underlip quivers, and his face is livid.

In these last weeks he has died a thousand deaths, and in his mind has suffered every kind of torment.

How often has he gone through this scene before, and yet how different it is—so much more trivial and usual, and yet so much more dreadful!

The ordinary words, "Good morning," and "Thank you," sound like a foreign language, and still the day strangely resembles other days.

As we turn a corner in the jail yard, and the frightful hanging machine appears, he averts his eyes, and stumbles and nearly falls.

At last he is in place, the black cap is pulled over his face and the noose adjusted.

The sheriff drops his handkerchief, the floor gives way with a creak—there is a sickening jerk, and the rope stretches taut;

Then after some minutes of convulsive struggle, that seem like years, all is quiet.

The doctor comes forward and feels the dying man's pulse.

He nods his head, and the little crowd disperses, while four men lower the body into a box.

There was not one man in that company but felt that something awful was happening which ought not to happen;—

Not one who did not know that the punishment was infinitely more devilish than the crime;—

Not one who at the bottom of his heart believed in his right or in any one else's right to dispose of the life of his fellow-man, and trifle with the mystery of death.

Yet with inexorable precision they went on to the end.

Even the felon himself accepted the inevitable, and never in all his talks with his confessor did he think of asking how forgiveness and love of neighbors and enemies was consistent with all this.

What was it that urged them relentlessly on?

When the sheriff's little boy climbs on his knee in the evening, and hides his face against the breast of his coat, and says, "Father, why did you do it?" what will he answer?

Was it fate and destiny, or divine justice?

Or was it not rather a poor, human makeshift for these—a necessity, a justice of the imagination?

"Don't cry, my child; you cannot understand now, but I am a servant of the State, and must do as the State directs."

The State?

Ah, thus it is that men conjure up specters out of nothingness, and name them, and cast their sins upon them, and fall down and worship them.

III.

I feel the force stirring within me which in time will re-form the world.

It does not push or obtrude, but I am conscious of it drawing gently and irresistibly at my vitals.

And I see that, as I am attracted, so I begin unaccountably to attract others.

I draw them and they in turn draw me, and we recognize a tendency to group ourselves anew.

Get in touch with the great central magnet, and you will yourself become a magnet;

And as more and more of us find our bearings and exert our powers, gradually the new world will take shape.

We become indeed legislators of the divine law, receiving it from God himself in the Mount, and human laws shrivel and dry up before us.

And I asked the force within my soul, "Who art thou?"

And it answered and said, "I am Love, the Lord of Heaven, and I would be called Love, the Lord of Earth.

I am the mightiest of all the heavenly hosts, and I am come to create the State that is to be."

It is well that the twentieth century finds men like Mr. Crosby writing, speaking, and working against the wrongs that, canker-like, are eating at the heart of our civilization; and it is good to know that he is only one of a rapidly growing band of young men and women who are consecrating their lives to the service of man and the making of a higher, juster, and truer civilization, where the key-note shall be love, expressed in coöperation for mutual help, growth, and happiness.

B. O. FLOWER.

Boston, Mass.

THE EMPIRE STATE'S INSANE.

WHETHER or not one has had the sad experience of close acquaintance with a person of unsound mind, there is in the very word "insanity" that which always jars upon and even shocks the finer sensibilities of humankind, and tends to stir within the sympathetic soul the deepest emotions of compassion.

There doubtless have been, and there may still be, cases in this country of harsh treatment of the insane at the hands of officials in whose care they have been placed. Such charges have, from time to time, been preferred, and have often been supported by apparently incontrovertible evidence. But as a result of my own observations, made under circumstances most favorable to correct conclusions, I am impressed with the belief that while the great State of New York has made progress unrivaled with her commerce, her inventions, her manufacturing, and her educational systems, she has kept pace in equal ratio in her provision for the care and treatment of those unfortunate citizens who are adjudged insane, and whose limited means will not permit their admission into one of the many excellent private hospitals of the State, as such institutions are as a rule conducted with a view to financial gain, and are therefore not necessarily philanthropic.

The views that I shall here present are based upon personal observations extending over a considerable period spent upon the grounds and within the buildings of one of our twelve State hospitals for the insane, and it is safe to assume that whatever may be said of this institution may be said with equal truth of the others; for all are maintained and conducted under the provisions of the same statutory laws, and their affairs are administered by resident officials acting under the general direction of one official body—the State Commission in Lunacy.

There is a somewhat prevalent though happily erroneous

idea that the sole purpose in the maintenance of insane hospitals by the State is that the *sane* may be protected from the *insane*—by confining the latter behind grated windows and guarded doors, where their illusions and delusions cannot lead them to do harm to persons or to property. From reports in years past, some doubtless overdrawn but others too true, I think the time was, rather, when some measures were necessary to protect the *insane* from the *sane*. But it would seem that a happy medium has at last been reached, in this State at least, and that the unfortunate beings now committed to our hospitals, whatever may be the real motive of friends or relatives, are nevertheless under a care (State) that is truly and earnestly solicitous of the best welfare of its insane citizens.

It is a belief, founded in part upon facts, that all State institutions in this and other States are subject in a measure to the influences of politics, and may therefore to a degree become the prey of political intriguers—of selfish and dishonest persons who by reason of unscrupulous shrewdness, money power, or the magic of some “political pull” are clothed with a little brief authority in matters concerning which they know absolutely nothing, and in which they have no honest or unselfish interest or intent. I would be happy indeed to believe that such conditions throughout our Republic were of the past, and that altruistic principles had at last gained a supremacy in our national and State politics. Such would, in truth, be in harmony with our religious and educational advancement. But we have not yet, in full, reached that happy condition. Recent investigations into the administration of the affairs of institutions of various States have proved that we are still far from the full realization of such hopes. But may it not be that Providence has decreed that the affairs of our State hospitals for the insane should be first (as they are already, in great measure) to be freed from the machinations of partizans and parties? Whatever may be the questionable practises, if there be such, that still influence the affairs of such institutions in other States, I am firmly of the opinion that the officers intrusted with the administration of the affairs of our hos-

pitals for the insane in the State of New York are at once competent, conscientious, sincere, and faithful in their performance of such duties.

Many State and Federal officers of trust, so called, might fittingly be designated "officers of rust," for no public good is accomplished and the only act that the incumbent can be relied upon to perform with any commendable certainty is the arduous task of drawing his salary. How fortunate it is, then, that, at the head and in the chief executive offices of her hospitals for the insane, New York State has placed men of unquestioned professional and business ability! For the position of superintendent of a hospital for the insane exceptional qualifications are requisite, for, together with his knowledge of medicine, his technical information upon the causes and conditions of insanity, and the most practical, modern, humane, and effective modes of treatment, such an officer must combine a rare executive ability with a capacity for details and routine work. Moreover, he must be tactful and resourceful in his methods, for a large number of persons, sane and insane, are under his constant supervision and care, and nothing less than tireless energy, eternal vigilance, and an always conscientious motive will enable the superintendent of an insane hospital fully to meet the manifold demands and exactions of his position.

Of the thirty-two prominent causes of insanity reported by the authorities, I shall mention but the first two: intemperance—the most frequent of all causes—and "adverse conditions" (loss of friends, business troubles, etc.), these two being in the ratio of five to three. Intemperance thus claims as its victims one-fifth of all the insane, and it is an awful and startling fact to contemplate that nearly *one-third* of that number are women.

Of the various vocations, the largest number of insane are from the mechanic class—outdoor workers. The commercial occupations, agricultural and pastoral pursuits, and the learned professions follow in the order named—the last furnishing about one-fourth the number of the first. Among these patients are to be found representatives of all races—men and

women of all ages, though the average is above middle age—and patients in all stages of insanity, from the mildest form to the most violent. One refusing ever to be quiet, another refusing ever to speak; one possessed of a delusion that he is a king, and controls a kingdom or owns it in his own name, and another ever protesting that he has been robbed of millions; one proclaiming himself the Saviour of the world, and another profaning all things sacred; one always happy and cheerful, smiling and singing, and another ever with an overwhelming sorrow.

The foregoing are but suggestions of the multitudinous forms and phases of insanity that may be observed in a State hospital for the insane, and, by analogy, the problem that daily confronts the authorities of such an institution is an appalling one. If the sole object in the confinement of the insane were the safety of the lives and property of the sane, the problem would lose much of its perplexity; for grated windows and vigilant guards would easily solve it. The paramount aim, however, is not confinement, but freedom; not enforced solitude and idleness for the patients, but rather diversion and exercise to the greatest possible degree with a view to the best results to the individual inmates. This method is in vogue in our State hospitals to an extent that to the lay mind seems quite incomprehensible; for men have been committed to hospitals under affidavits by friends or relatives setting forth evidence of an utter loss of reason and a marked tendency to violence or to suicide, but who have, under hospital treatment, soon been at work about the grounds of the institution, orderly and contented, and often many of them in a fair way to permanent recovery. But these same patients, if left with no diversion or occupation, in enforced solitude, would ever brood over their troubles, real or imaginary, and eventually become incurables.

The influence that experienced attendants and trained nurses exert over a ward of insane men or women is truly marvelous and speaks volumes for the mode of dealing with patients in our State hospitals. I have seen two or three young

male attendants in full charge and control of a hall containing fifteen or twenty patients, any one of whom alone could terrorize a neighborhood and in the judgment of the inexperienced would require a dozen strong men to control him and prevent his doing violence to himself or others. It is not unusual for the attendants, upon calling for a patient whose commitment has been duly issued by the judge of the county in which he is a citizen, to find such unfortunate locked and barred in a room, or being guarded and overpowered by a dozen robust and trembling neighbors. The one or two attendants, however, seldom find difficulty in safely conducting the patient to the hospital. These facts do not prove that the man may not be really and even violently insane, but rather illustrate how much there is in the mode and method of handling cases of insanity. When it is remembered that many of the most violent lunatics are still in possession of robust physical health, their muscular strength often greatly increased by their disordered mental condition, the problem of controlling such patients without resort to the old methods of force and almost violence becomes the greater, and its solution (for it is solved) the more remarkable. And only when it is remembered that in New York to-day there are confined in the State hospitals more than twenty thousand patients are the magnitude and responsibility of the State's charge in the matter of its insane fairly comprehended.

Enormous expense is necessarily involved in the support of these twelve institutions—several millions of dollars annually. But surely in this case the end justifies the means; for, in striking contrast to the neglect, cruelty, and inhumanity of the madhouse of less than half a century ago, we have the almost perfect methods of to-day—the results of wise legislation and of the labors of efficient medical and executive officers. By the modern method of interesting the patient whenever possible in some useful work or occupation, much of the routine work of the institution is accomplished by the inmates themselves; and though economy is not the real and important object to be attained, much expense is saved, in fact, while

the benefits that accrue to the patients from this exercise and diversion are almost inestimable.

It may be interesting to note here the many trades and occupations represented among the inmates of a State hospital. Every learned profession as well as every industrial pursuit has its representatives, as also has every grade and condition of society—the highest and the lowest, the Christian and the scoffer, the educated and the illiterate;—all are here to be found. Patients from the wealthy classes are not as a rule committed to State institutions, but are well cared for in private hospitals, where the best of treatment is afforded and special privileges and even luxuries may be secured at a proportionate expense; but I doubt much whether wealth there insures to such patients more skilled treatment or better care than is afforded to patients of lesser means who are the wards of the State of New York: though with the former more individual attention is possible, and more regard for each inmate's choice of associates is practicable.

The matter of entertainment and recreation for the patients has also received thoughtful consideration from the officials, and during the summer frequent field-days are arranged and athletic sports are participated in by the attendants and by many of the patients as well; bands and other musical organizations are maintained; frequent lectures and theatrical entertainments are provided for long winter evenings; and a weekly ball in which a large number of the patients take part is allowed—the rule being that each woman patient shall have as a partner a male attendant, and *vice versa*. To be sure, the patients are not all graceful dancers, but that may as truly be said of the dancers at any "sane" ball; and as to their deportment, that too compares very favorably with the deportment at any public ball. It is remarkable how many delusions of the insane are apparently laid aside for these social occasions, and how much real pleasure and enjoyment the patients derive from such recreations.

Religious services are held regularly, and are attended by a large proportion of the inmates. The Sunday evening sacred

concerts are looked forward to with much pleasurable anticipation, and many of the patients take an active part in the readings, the chorus, and the solo singing, as well as in the instrumental music. Strange as it may seem, a congregation made up largely of insane persons is by no means the least attentive of audiences. Though not all the patients may comprehend the discourse, they are nevertheless quiet, orderly, and apparently appreciative listeners—probably as attentive as the *average* church congregation. I heard of a well-meaning but deplorably absent-minded clergyman who accepted an invitation to address an assemblage, on a Sunday morning, in one of our State institutions, and, facing his audience of several hundred inmates, said, "Gentlemen, I am glad indeed to find so many of you here this morning." The writer would not go to so great an extreme in these observations, but our insane are in truth fortunate that they are cared for in the way the State of New York is now discharging that great trust.

It is naturally concluded that life in such an institution for a man adjudging himself *sane* would be always gloomy and distasteful; but that is by no means true. The physicians in the State hospitals, if they are conscientious—and I believe most of them are—are as deeply interested in the improvement, the mental and physical welfare, of the several patients under their personal care as if they were engaged in a private practise where their success and standing as physicians, as well as their financial success, would depend entirely upon faithfulness to details and their skill in the performance of professional duties. There are always cases of exceptional interest to the scientific mind, and always an opportunity for study and research—an illimitable field; for no two forms of insanity are identical. Then, too, there are occasional humorous incidents even amid so much that induces pity and compassion. One patient, a dignified and scholarly man of past middle age, for many years himself a successful practitioner of medicine, resolutely and emphatically proclaims that "all doctors are cranks and quacks," excepting only from this sweeping assertion hospital physicians, whom he not inaptly terms "brain-testers." An-

other patient adjudges all men "insane," excepting only himself, and with considerable logic and much ingenuity of argument proceeds to prove his statement that "the world has gone daft." Still another firmly asserts that "the world is all upside down and going wrong," because of its politics and parties—their bosses, with their "grabs" and "steals."

As one reflects upon these sayings of insanity,—in this day of patent medicines and bogus remedies, of faith healers and ward heelers, of specialists and cranks and creeds, of frauds and treachery and trickery in politics,—and finally upon the shams and hypocrisies in the so-called higher circles of society, the question arises as to whether, after all, there is not something of a "method in the madness" of each and every one, in turn, that I have quoted. The logic of the language with which the bard of Avon armed young *Hamlet* to play upon his mother's guilty conscience was not more deep than is produced by the disordered mind of many an inmate of the hospitals for the insane.

The prevalence of insanity throughout the world must ever remain a source of infinite regret, but the progress that has been made and that promises to be made in providing for the care and treatment of such unfortunate beings must be of infinite satisfaction to every thoughtful mind. A full consideration of this question from the standpoint of the statistician would necessarily involve a comparison between the numbers of insane in this and in other States and other countries; but such comparison is not within the scope of this article. The number of insane provided for by our State hospitals, increased by the population of the many private institutions within our State, might seem disproportionate, if considered on the basis of areas only; but when we consider our dense population, the large number of immigrants annually entering our great metropolis, and finally the extreme intensity of the competition that marks the struggle for the acquisition of wealth among our citizens, we may conclude after all that the number of our insane in New York State, though large, is not disproportionate, all conditions and circumstances being weighed.

In conclusion, as a citizen of New York I am glad to believe that the State, through its Commission in Lunacy and its boards of managers, and they through their respective medical and executive officers, is wisely and well discharging its great trust. I doubt much whether the insane of any other State, or of any other country, receive more humane, more studied, more skilful, or more effective treatment than do those who by virtue of their residence are fortunately entitled to the wise guardian care of the imperial State of New York.

FRANK LESLIE WARNE.

Willard, N. Y.

ITINERANT SPEECHMAKING IN THE LAST CAMPAIGN.

DURING the recent Presidential campaign there developed a unique phase of political oratory. Formal addresses in the large towns yielded chief place to the new spellbinding from the special car. By the aid of this traveling rostrum, a score of speeches in as many counties were often made within a single day, and a hundred meetings between Monday morning and Saturday night became of frequent occurrence. It is patent, therefore, that peculiar requirements were made of rhetorical composition and delivery. It was demanded of the orator to speak almost continuously with small preparation; to combine, in a five-minute talk, thought and expression in striking and convincing form; to suit with plan and style the ever-changing character of the audiences, and to contend with the omnipresent unrest of a crowd out for excitement or a holiday. Hence, it is natural that the speeches, constructed to meet these new conditions, should present many novel features of character and style.

Usually but a small part of each was calculated to convince through the reasoning faculties of the audience; this part was approximately from one-sixth to one-seventh, and the remainder aimed to influence solely through direct or indirect appeals to the feelings. The passages devoted to argument were, on account of their necessary brevity, unavoidably fragmentary and often comprised but a few sentences. One of Senator Depew's arguments, for example, began with the premise that Mr. Bryan had once urged the payment of \$20,000,000 for the Philippines; and in semi-serious vein it continued: "And now he says our title is not good. And he is a lawyer! If he worked for the payment of \$20,000,000 for a country to which we have no title, he is not fit to be President. He would ruin the Treasury."

On the other hand, the Democratic candidate often expressed

his contention in the form of a series of questions that, arranged in syllogistic order and implying in themselves the answer, led to an apparent *reductio ad absurdum*. Thus he asked: "If the Trust is good, why did the Republican platform denounce Trusts? If bad, why did the Republican Administration allow more Trusts to be organized? If some are good and some are bad, can you tell me the difference?"

Many of the other arguments were advanced in similar style, and, though they may be termed successful in view of existing difficulties, yet the main attention is drawn not to them but to the more numerous appeals to feeling as most fairly representative of the character of the orator's productions. An examination, therefore, of the different phases of feeling that were addressed, and of the methods displayed in so doing, will indicate the general nature of the speeches—not always, perhaps, as they were intended, but as they would reasonably come to the ear of the ordinary listener.

As a first result of such an examination, it is evident that the phase of feeling to which most conspicuous appeals were made was that of desire in the hearer for his personal welfare. Not only were the main efforts of the orator put forth with reference to this desire, and the most famous political shibboleth of modern times, "the full dinner pail," founded upon it, but to the correlative fear of personal evil was addressed the bulk of the so-called "calamity howling" that was frequently in evidence. Thus Governor Roosevelt implied a warning by the words, "When the dinner pail is empty it is serious business"; Mr. Bryan accomplished a like result through the remark, "When a Trust closes a factory it does not invite a President to be present at the closing"; and Senator Depew made a similar insinuation—more by the significant arrangement of his words than by their actual meaning—when he began a speech by saying, "Well, my friends, time is short, and so I'll leave just this with you to paste upon the wall: '94 to '97—'97 to '99."

The majority of the passages addressing this fear, however, were far more direct, and Mr. Bryan was not far out

of fashion when he prophesied "an industrial despotism that compels millions of people to get on their knees and pray to the Trust, 'give us this day our daily bread.'" In the second place, the speeches were calculated to influence through the liking for personal righteousness or dislike of its opposite. Under this head may be noted Mr. Bryan's declaration that "striped clothes should be put on big thieves like little ones," and Governor Roosevelt's statement: "Beyond all other issues are those of orderly liberty under the law and of civic honesty." As third in importance, the feeling of national pride was addressed, and the speakers often said in effect what Governor Roosevelt once said in terms: "I know you will not, in the face of the nations of the earth, allow this flag to be dishonored," and "every man who is worth his salt is proud of his country." In the fourth place, the love of humor was appealed to by the orators. Frequent sarcasm and ridicule at the expense of their opponents were indulged in; these, though well enough adapted to raise a laugh by the audience and to concentrate attention upon the speaker's words, were not always of a dignified nature. In this manner Mr. Bryan, during a speech in the celery-growing district of Michigan, referred to the alleged hostility of the Republicans to the Boers and requested the newspaper men present "not to mention the fact that the celery was raised by Hollanders, for I am afraid the Republicans will boycott celery and use onions." In similar vein Senator Depew expressed his view of the situation by the sentence, "We are not called upon to plow a new theory with a Nebraska colt," and again implied ridicule in his usual genial manner by opening a speech with the words: "I understand Brother Stanchfield was here this afternoon and quoted my views. The only difference between me and Brother Stanchfield is that I have studied the question."

A remark should also be made of the strikingly numerous expressions everywhere in evidence that were merely claims of strength open or veiled, and that consequently could derive force only through the peculiar form of love of victory that impels so many persons to vote with the party most likely to

succeed. These expressions range from Mr. Depew's frank prophecies of party triumph to Governor Roosevelt's congratulation of a negro audience that "so many had determined to vote according to conscience," and to his mention of the "few" gold Democrats who would vote against his party.

The divisions of feeling less prominently addressed were the love of national uprightness, resentment for wrongs real or fancied, prejudice of class, love of flattery, admiration of national heroes, and reverence for Deity. In addition, Mr. Bryan at times addressed the broader form of altruistic sentiment through such sentences as: "If the cause of Liberty triumph here, then it will triumph around the world," and others of similar import. As might be expected, the speeches in common contained abundant charges of evil-doing by the speaker's opponents, generally insinuated rather than direct; and only slightly less numerous were the florid praises of his own party. There were also many promises of party good conduct if successful, while not a few direct requests for votes were made.

Several other methods were employed to increase the general effect. References were made, whenever possible, to the locality in which the speech was delivered. At Milton Senator Depew remarked, "This town bears the name of a great poet," and then proceeded to typify the conditions under Democratic and Republican rule by the names, respectively, of the greatest two of that poet's works. The same speaker often aroused the enthusiasm of his audience directly by calling for "three cheers" for the candidates or for the probabilities of party success. On one occasion Governor Roosevelt took a soldier of the United States army with him upon the platform, and, while arguing that the army was not too large in proportion to the country's population, introduced an object-lesson by saying, "Compare this soldier here with this audience, and then the army with the nation." Probably, however, no method of reaching the listener was more successful than that employed by Senator Hanna. During a speech in Indiana he said: "I hear on every side, 'What's the matter with Hanna?' Now I

want to know what's the matter with Indiana!" Needless to say, the assemblage gladly answered for its State in the usual manner.

In style of wording, these semi-extemporaneous addresses were, first of all, noticeably direct and vigorous. Never before have orators spoken to large audiences in so frank and personal a fashion. Every-day, man-to-man talk was the rule; the meaning of a sentence was always clear to the dullest understanding, although its construction was often inelegant and slovenly or even grammatically incorrect. There were many isolated phrases, also, that were well turned and crowded with meaning; there were epigrams of graceful form and considerable brilliancy; and in almost every speech was embodied an informal peroration undeniably striking, if sometimes savoring too greatly of the highly-colored and turgid eloquence of the frontier. The terminology was emphatic, almost to the point of roughness; this, while at times calculated to prevent a desirable moderation and polish, caused the sentence to convey the extreme of meaning to the average ear. An alleged misstatement was not often mentioned otherwise than as a "lie," and it was with comparative mildness that Governor Roosevelt affirmed that another speaker "did or ought to know, not only that the statements were not true, but that there was not one shadow of excuse for them." The epithets employed regarding other transactions were equally terse and expressive.

The use of slang was frequent. Governor Roosevelt told an audience, "You'll vote right because you're built that way," and Senator Depew's listeners were assured that they could "bet their lives" and be "dead sure" in many instances. Well-known phraseology was sometimes applied in a novel connection, as when Mr. Bryan said, "God himself implanted in every human being love of liberty, and what God has joined together let no man put asunder"; or as when he charged his opponents with having altered the commandment to read, "Thou shalt not steal on a small scale."

In somewhat similar style, Senator Depew translated the

Democratic promises to mean in effect, "If you'll only go through hell, I'll get you into heaven"; while the Nebraska orator once asked his audience "to place Mr. Lincoln at one end of the Republican party and Mr. Hanna at the other and watch the toboggan slide." In contrast with such expressions was the more pretentious and impassioned rhetoric sometimes used. Of a great issue Mr. Bryan said: "God never made people selfish enough to want to govern other people and then unselfish enough to govern them well. Republicans, do you want to tear down the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor and send it back to France to tell them we are out of the liberty business? Instead, we ought to put another Statue of Liberty in the harbor of Manila and proclaim liberty throughout the Orient." In like manner, but on the other side of the question, Governor Roosevelt declared: "Woe to the man who preaches such a doctrine! Danger of Imperialism? Aye, but the danger will never come till our people are foolish enough to allow anarchy, license, mob violence to take the place of that orderly liberty under the law which we inherited as the most precious heritage from the fathers."

Outside of what has been considered, a quite different phase of the itinerant speaker's work is of peculiar interest, both because it was not present by his own choice and because, like the reason of its advent, it was completely new in American speechmaking. For the first time, something akin to the English "heckling" made its appearance, and the immunity that has hitherto protected the rostrum, like the pulpit, disappeared. The audiences demanded a part in the discussion, and, through various forms of interpolation, sought to test the arguments presented. Each meeting involved an impromptu debate, with a new opposition forever changing and never overcome. How to meet such interrogatories, to silence them while retaining credit with the audience, and to regain control of the discussion, presented a varying problem for the speaker. The method adopted for its solution was necessarily determined by the different circumstances of each case. But, in general, a question of remark that imputed blame to the speaker's party

was met successfully by a direct denunciation of the alleged greater offenses of his opponents.

Thus to a question regarding the suffrage law in North Carolina Mr. Bryan usually responded by enlarging upon a similar law in Puerto Rico; and to those regarding the "Trusts" Governor Roosevelt replied by references to the Ice and Cotton Bale Trusts as connected with his opponents. The aid of some sarcastic expression was usually employed, the Governor saying that he must ask the Democrats "to write the essay on that subject," while Mr. Bryan fortified his assertions by a bulletin issued under the McKinley Administration, adding that, therefore, he knew "it must be right."

To the mere calls for "cheers for Bryan," Governor Roosevelt would respond "Why?" and, as the disturber was seldom prepared to defend his position, the Governor had a free field to show why the cheers should *not* be given.

On one occasion Mr. Bryan effectively trapped a questioner. "How about the Cotton Bale Trust?" was asked; and the orator replied that the Trust alluded to controlled but five per cent. of the total output of cotton, while the Salt Trust controlled ninety-five per cent. of the product of salt. Then he demanded, suddenly, "Are you honest?" "Yes," replied the man. "Then you must be ignorant," said the candidate; "for no honest man would condemn a five per cent. Trust and defend a ninety-five per cent. Trust because it was Republican."

Mr. Bryan, however, was not so successful when he attempted to allay the rather violent interruption at Ann Arbor by the remark, "If I were an Imperialist, I should call out an army to suppress you." The confusion continued until the firm hand of the law was laid upon the principal offenders.

Governor Roosevelt lost patience at times, and during one of his meetings commented upon the ignorance of a questioner by saying, "If you really believe that, I don't wonder you cheer for Bryan or anything else."

But perhaps the most simple and effective quietus was put upon a turbulent auditor by Senator Depew. After one of the speaker's assertions, a man shrieked from the crowd: "You

are a liar!" "I will answer you later," urbane answered the Senator; and the audience cheered.

A welcome change from the usual character of the interruptions was made when some listener audibly supported the argument advanced. Thus the Governor of New York asked his audience "to contrast present conditions——" And a kindly supporter interjected, "with those of eight years ago." "Yes," rejoined the Governor; "but without ice," added another man. After acknowledging this final assistance the candidate was allowed to proceed alone.

Mere outbreaks of rowdyism such as Senator Depew experienced at Cobleskill need not be considered. Generally speaking, however, where in ordinary respectable meetings questions have been propounded to the orator, the answers made, if not fully responsive, were given in good temper and in effective language; and, appealing to the predominant thought or feeling, they satisfied the audience.

Should this tendency toward dialogue in place of monologue increase, the effective speaker must employ greater keenness and foresight with more rapid, concise, and direct expression than have been necessary hitherto. Whether a permanent modification of campaign oratory will result is a question yet to be solved.

In addition to what has been mentioned, many incidents external to the speechmaking have contributed to its setting an interesting and unique one. On the one hand, the speakers have been assailed with stones and other missiles, their car windows have been broken, and their improvised rostrums have collapsed. Thus serious injury menaced Senator Depew by the falling of a temporary speaker's stand, and Governor Roosevelt narrowly escaped the stones that entered the window of his car. In contrast, many displays of friendliness were amusing and unmistakable. New York's Chief Executive was not likely to doubt the significance of the placard which, as his train rushed past, displayed the sentiment, "*Teddy is O. K.*"; nor could he reasonably mistake the meaning of such a transparency as was held aloft by the Cornell students with

the inscription, "*Vive le bon Teddy; a bas Bryan, dit l'école d'architecture.*"

The first appearance of the orator was often set for seven in the morning, and Mr. Bryan was scheduled to make more than thirty addresses in one day. In a single week, Senator Depew spoke one hundred and ten times in forty-three counties, and was heard by one hundred and fifty thousand people; while the tours of Mr. Bryan and Governor Roosevelt were the most remarkable ever made. During eight weeks the latter candidate visited twenty-four States, made six hundred and seventy-three speeches in five hundred and sixty-seven towns, traveled twenty-one thousand two hundred and nine miles, and was heard by three millions of persons. This trip alone included more miles traveled and more speeches made than were represented by the campaign work of all the previous candidates for President and Vice-President during the last century, excepting only the labors of Mr. Bryan.

Such facts as these, together with the other characteristics of last year's speechmaking, force the conclusion that a new phase of political oratory has developed, and that, however one may regard its desirability, not since the days of the anti-slavery excitement have meetings attracted interest so widespread and audiences so vast. Far from the voice having lost its power as an instrument of instruction, one may well question if a new career for the orator has not just begun.

CLEVELAND FREDERICK BACON.

New York.

THE CRIMINAL NEGRO.

IV. ADVANTAGES AND ABUSES OF SOUTHERN PENAL SYSTEMS.

THERE can be no doubt that Southern penal laws are unequally administered. In some instances this encourages crime, as where there is collusion between lawyers and magistrates. A negress asks a lawyer how much it will cost her to whip Laura Brown, against whom she has a grievance. He goes to the justice and arranges that the fine shall be \$10. She is cautioned not to carry any weapons, or do any "cutting"; and if her grievance is equal to the sum named, she administers the whipping and is fined according to contract.

The office of justice is shunned by the better class of men, and few honest persons accept it. The salary is small, and the rule is: no conviction, no fee for either justice or jurors. This is a direct bribe for conviction. There is often small chance for appeal, as most negroes cannot secure the \$100 bond required. Justices and constables are often in collusion. A constable will give a negro called a "striker" money to go out and play craps. He is informed when and where the striker will gather his crowd, and then swoops down upon them. The striker gets a dividend after the constable and justice have their share. When a man cannot pay his fine, he goes to the county farm or on the road gang, where he works out his fine at the rate of about thirty cents a day. In any case the county gains through his conviction, while in the North it is often the loser. In the rural districts there is not so much fraud. If a striker appears, or the justice comes down and fines a number of a planter's negroes during the busy season, they are reasonably certain to get horsewhipped for their untimely interest in justice. The planter has little respect for the justice. Negro justices are less fair than the whites, and they are often unwisely chosen. There are but few of them remaining.

The following incidents illustrate their methods. A negro was tried, and the jury brought in a verdict of "not guilty."

The justice said: "That doesn't suit me. I discharge the jury, set aside the verdict, and will retry the case." Some of the penalties were so severe for trifling offenses that the white officers have taken the convicted negroes outside and simply turned them loose. In the higher courts the criminal meets with more consideration, but even here there is haste in his trial and indifference in appointing his counsel. Penalties for the same offense are most inconsistent. It may be one year or ten. In some of the States there is no distinction between petit and grand larceny, and there may be seen a negro serving three years for stopping by a field to feed his mule some corn. His labor is worth at least \$180 a year, so it is no hardship to the State to keep him. On the other hand, judges sometimes good humoredly dismiss cases in which a light penalty would serve as a good lesson.

Negroes are more numerous and of less value than white men, and are dealt with more summarily. A Southern officer put into humorous English what is really, though often unconsciously, the practise. He said: "If two white men quarrel and one *murders* the other, we imprison the culprit, and in due season pardon him; if a white man *kills* a negro, we let him off; if a negro murders a white man, we like as not lynch him; if a negro kills a negro we imprison him." As a matter of fact, in crimes concerning negroes alone the penalty is more often imprisonment than hanging. When white men are arrested for gambling they are fined or released, but if they are caught gambling with negroes they receive the full penalty of the law—"just for the indignity of the thing." In the administration of the law, both consciously and unconsciously there comes in this prejudice. This can be seen in the application of lynch law. Immediately succeeding the war, the negro was lynched for rape alone. Within the last six years nearly nine hundred persons have been lynched in the South. Among the causes are such crimes as rioting, incendiarism, robbery, larceny, stock-poisoning, and barn-stealing. Five women are included in this list. In Georgia a strenuous attempt was made to lynch a negro editor who had printed some scathing

comments upon election frauds. Those who think the law fairly administered will have some difficulty in paralleling these facts among the whites. There is no excuse for the plea that the law will not take its course; for judges, jurors, and lawyers are almost exclusively white men and will mete out the proper proportion of that variable quantity called justice. This unequal administration of the law applies also between negro and white women. The criminal is first a negro and then a woman—in the whites' estimation. Their sympathy may be aroused, as when the woman is a mother, but rarely their chivalry. Some States have conditions superior to this; others are inferior.

The penal division consists of three correlated systems—State, county, and municipal, which work in closer harmony than in the North. The State system includes penitentiaries, convict farms, and camps; the county consists of jails, county farms, and road-gang camps, and the municipal embraces the city prisons and street gangs. Before comparing the individual States, let us see what features are common to them all. In the State systems they are as follows:

1. The emphasis is laid upon hard labor and punishment. All institutions and criminals must be self-supporting. Hard labor means actual work from sunrise to sunset, with only time out for meals. During July and August, in most States, two hours are allowed for the noon meal in outdoor work, but it is less than an hour for indoor work. Labor on the farms, carefully estimated and including the days out due to inclement weather, is slightly in excess of the hours for unskilled labor in the North. In mills and other industries the time is longer. Institutions are not only self-supporting, but are a source of revenue to the State. This revenue is not used to pay the cost of conviction and for the improvement of the convict's condition, but goes into the general State fund. This is an unwise use of it. Even in States where the revenues are large, so extreme is this desire for profit that I have known pardons to be delayed until after the busy season on the farm was over.

2. Total absence of reformatory measures. A superintendent

is valued, not for his enlightened administration, but for the dollars he turns in. In all institutions are found children ranging from eight to fourteen years of age. They eat, sleep, and work with the older criminals. The age of criminal intent seems to be less definite with reference to negroes, for in my investigations I saw no white children. The following facts show how detrimental such a condition is to the prevention of crime: In Mississippi there are 110 out of 913 criminals who are under 18 years of age; in Georgia, there were, in 1896, 234 under 18, in Virginia 76, and in North Carolina 60. From the latest reports obtainable I find in 5 States 530 convicts who are of an age when they would be in reformatories in the North. When the free social intercourse among convicts is remembered, it is seen how great is the opportunity of these juveniles for finishing their education in crime, gambling, bad habits, and immorality.

3. The States all have some form and degree of the convict-farm system. Some combine industries, but the more usual way is to lease the labor of the convicts. These constitute the convict camps. By the farm system is meant that the State owns or leases the land and works its own convicts.

4. Each State permits social intercourse among convicts. In some States there are certain restrictions, as silence at meals; but this is the exception rather than the rule. The absence of this in the North is the most marked characteristic of the system.

5. With the exception of North and South Carolina and Virginia (for the women), there is the congregate cell system. Usually there are from one to three large rooms, which accommodate the convicts at night. This is conducive to social intercourse.

6. Except in Virginia and North Carolina, there are no matrons, nor any female officers to protect the women convicts from immorality while in the camps and at work in the fields.

7. The discipline is whipping and solitary confinement. In South Carolina a thumb strap is occasionally used. Where the

convicts are disciplined by the State officers, the number of lashes rarely exceeds twenty-five. In lessee camps there are no such restrictions. These punishments are applied indiscriminately to both sexes. With the exception of Louisiana, criminals are guarded by armed attendants, and are tracked with dogs when they escape. Notwithstanding these measures the escapes are numerous. Under the lessee system they have reached 150 in one year. They now average 50 per year.

8. All the Southern States have passed through the lessee stage, and Mississippi alone has no form of hired labor of its convicts.

9. Most penal institutions are now controlled by regularly appointed boards. A few retain the commission system. Formerly railway commissions controlled the convicts, because their labor was upon railways. Florida's convicts are still under the charge of the commissioner of agriculture, as their labor is of that nature.

10. There are no systems of identification, and with a few exceptions the institution reports consist only of the names of the convicts, together with the deaths, escapes, pardons, and nature of the crime.

11. Almost all the States have good time laws, and Virginia has a parole system. These laws usually allow two months' time each on the first two years, three months upon the next two, and four months each in the succeeding years. This generally applies only to first offenders, and it is allowed only during good conduct. An attempt to escape causes forfeiture of all the good time earned. In North Carolina they have a commutation plan. The convict receives five days off every month for good behavior and has placed to his credit \$1 for every ten days he secures. When he earns \$5 in this way he is entitled to an additional five days of good time.

12. The food varies but little. It consists of pork, corn bread, rice, and molasses. Sometimes beef and coffee are allowed, and vegetables when obtainable. Where prisoners earn money for overtime work they are permitted to buy additional food and other luxuries.

The characteristic features of the county and municipal systems are as follows:

1. Bad sanitary and social conditions in the jails and city prisons. Innocent and guilty, young and old, are thrown together. There are no matrons.

2. The labor system, which, for the county, consists of a farm and chain-gangs who repair and construct roads. County farms are inferior to State farms. The sentences are short and there is little interest in the convicts. They have more unwholesome food, secure their own clothes, and work in more inclement weather. There is not the interest that the State has in their good health. In Alabama county convicts are leased to the mines under State supervision, and in Georgia one county leases to another. The municipal system of labor is street gangs, while the women work in public buildings. In a few instances they work on the streets and in quarries.

The following comparison of States includes: evolution of the present system, buildings, labor, discipline, food, clothes, rest and recreation, and reformatory influences. The position of women in these institutions is shown under each head:

1. *Systems*.—Mississippi has adopted the State farm system more completely than any other State. Before the civil war, the prison population was about 125, all whites. At that time manufactures were conducted within the prison. After the war the negroes began coming in, and in the reconstruction period of the State the convicts were turned over to a lessee. He had full control of them, and was given a bonus of \$20,000 to relieve the State of their care. Most of them worked upon farms. Later they were leased for a revenue. They were often sublet to planters and railway companies. They were not under the slightest control of the State and could be overworked, lost, or killed. In 1888 the evils were so great that an investigation was held, and in 1890 the abolition of the system was decreed, to take effect in 1894. The State now owns three farms, but also works its convicts upon other farms, which it has leased. This is undesirable, and they will be consolidated upon one farm of about 12,000 acres. Upon

this farm plan, the revenue to the State varies from \$30,000 to \$100,000 a year. The method of control is through a State board and the warden is the chief executive officer.

Louisiana presents a marked contrast. The lessee system is in full operation, although it has been abolished by the constitutional convention. The new law goes into effect in 1901, when the present lease expires. The revenue under this lease is \$50,000 a year, regardless of the number of convicts. Louisiana began her State system in 1834 by erecting a penitentiary. Manufactures were conducted here. After the war the lessee system began, first within the walls, and finally leasing the men outside. They were leased to numerous parties and in many enterprises. The practise is now to lease them to one contractor. Louisiana is the only Southern State, excepting Florida, that has a complete lessee system. The penitentiary is still retained, and here the sick are cared for and the white women remain. The new plan contemplates working the strongest convicts upon levees, an inferior class upon farms, and the infirm will be kept at the walls, as now. There is a board of control, and a State warden who inspects the camps; but the food, clothing, management, etc., are under the lessee's control.

Alabama combines both the farm and lease systems. Of all Southern States, Alabama has passed through the most difficulties. Prior to 1866, the convicts were kept within the walls, and worked at manufactures. After the war they were leased, but as there were no State inspectors the abuses were many. In 1872 a farm was bought and stocked and an attempt made to work it. This was a failure, and in 1875 the lease system was revived. It is only with the present excellent management that serious abuses have been abolished. Alabama has had numerous investigations into alleged cruelties. Barbarous punishments, as shower baths, crucifix, yoke and buck, and by water, have been practised up to within a short time ago. In this last penalty, a man is strapped on his back and water poured slowly upon the upper lip. It quite effectually stops breathing and is very dangerous. These conditions

led to the appointment of a board of inspectors in 1885. They now have quite complete supervision and there are State representatives in every convict camp. In 1890 the State provided farms. There are now two such farms, and upon one is located a large cotton mill, in which the women and children are employed. The remainder of the convicts are leased in the mines and saw mills. The farm in Alabama is not designed to solve the problem, as in Mississippi, but was made necessary by the large number of broken-down men from the various camps who would be useless unless lighter outdoor work were found. The farm is the recruiting place for the men from the different camps.

Georgia is the last State to abolish the lease system. As early as 1817 she established a penitentiary where the whites were worked. Manufacturing on State account was the method. The lessee system was in force from 1868 to 1897. The full control and custody of the convicts were with the lessees. More comments have been made upon Georgia's barbarous system than upon that of any other Southern State, and from its history this would seem justified. In no States are there evidences of such brutality to women, for women were leased out in the same way as the men and at the same occupations. As in Alabama, there is now a State farm, where women, children, and infirm men are worked. Georgia still has a "contract" system, which involves some of the old abuses of the lessee system. The lessors are usually owners of mines, lumber camps, brickyards, etc. There is now a prison commission and a warden who visits the various camps.

Florida's system is similar to that of Louisiana, but in some respects is less favorable. The convicts are leased out in fourteen different camps and have only one inspector. The women are leased in twos and threes in various camps, instead of being confined together in one. Turpentine mills and phosphate mines are the industries. The control of the convicts is vested in the commissioner of agriculture.

South Carolina's system resembles the Northern systems more than those of the other States. She thus far has the

only penitentiary building not used solely for a hospital. She has passed through all the evils of the lessee system and now combines farming and manufacturing. The farms are for the same purpose as those in Alabama and Georgia. Most of the convicts are employed in a large cotton mill. Their labor only is contracted for, the State retaining complete control of them. The management of the convicts is vested in a board and the warden is the chief executive officer.

North Carolina maintains a large penitentiary, conducts manufactures, operates three farms, and leases some convicts. It includes every phase of the Southern methods. The lease system has been gradually abolished, for the same reasons as in other States: it is more profitable to the State to work its own convicts, and they are more humanely treated. The women and less able men are kept within the walls, while the boys and other convicts are on the farms. North Carolina is the only State that still leases or hires convicts to railway companies. There have been few fierce conflicts in this State; it has been a gradual change from the lessee system. In outward form the penitentiary resembles Northern institutions, but its management and discipline are upon a much different basis and are somewhat lax.

With reference to Virginia almost nothing need be said. Her system dates back to the days when mutilation was a common penalty. The white criminals were first confined in the county prisons. She has the oldest prison building, modeled after Thomas Jefferson's ideas. The lease system existed in this State also. Its present method consists of farming and manufactures, which are conducted upon the contract plan, the institution retaining control of the convicts. The main industry is the manufacture of shoes. Virginia combines some of the evils of the old system with the more advanced practises, and presents incongruities that show that tradition and progress are still at war.

It will be seen that all the Southern States have had the lease system, and that all but Florida have abolished it. The State farm is popular, but the States seeking large revenues

still cling to some form of the contract system. It will be seen also that the freeing of the slaves was the cause of the establishment of the lease system, and only the growing away from the slavery ideas is making the more humane changes possible.

FRANCES A. KELLOR.

The University of Chicago.

A CONVERSATION

WITH

ERNEST H. CROSBY

EMBODYING PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS OF

COUNT TOLSTOY AS PHILOSOPHER, PROPHET,
AND MAN.

Q. Mr. Crosby, as one of the American pilgrims who have journeyed thousands of miles to far-away Russia in order to see the great apostle of renunciation, and as a student of his works, you are, I think, among the best qualified of our countrymen to speak of Count Tolstoy and intelligently interpret his social and religious views. Hence, I hope you will tell us something of the man and his theories. What were your impressions of Count Tolstoy? We always like to know whether the prophet who bids us seek the heights has himself journeyed along the steep, rugged, and brier-strewn path-way; whether he is consistent; whether he is a doer as well as a teacher of the higher law. Of course, we know that the illustrious author and philosopher has made what the world considers a great sacrifice, but beyond this is he, in his daily life, in his home, and among his humble neighbors, all that we have pictured him from his writings?

A. Count Tolstoy has often been charged with being inconsistent, and I do not suppose that he would claim that he is consistent; but from my own observation when I visited him at his home at Yasnaya Poliana I should say that he is one of the most consistent men in the world. To abolish at once all the distinctions which centuries of rank, privilege, wealth, and education have made between a man and his neighbors was an undertaking of no small difficulty, especially when

his family only agree with him in part. Tolstoy's food and raiment are as simple and inexpensive as those of the peasants around him. He does all the cleaning, sweeping, and chamberwork connected with his own room and person. As far as he can, he has banished all luxury from his house. When I was there, there was not even a rug or carpet on any floor that I saw. With the exception of a few family portraits, a piano and a guitar, and some shelves of books, there was nothing visible in the house except necessities. The service at table was simpler than in many an American poor man's house. He was not well during my visit of two days, and I did not see him engaged in manual labor; but it is well known that he does as much of it as his age and health permit. He told me that he preferred plowing to any other manual work. Like the peasants, he was accustomed to lead a horse with a harrow, while plowing with a one-horse plow. A pair of boots made by the Count are exhibited at the Museum at Moscow. They are doubtless better adapted to a museum than to the human foot, but they show the earnestness of his endeavors to cope with the disadvantages of his education as a man without hands or muscles.

The question of consistency recalls Count Tolstoy's advice to me on that subject. "Speak out what you think," he said, "and you will be furnishing weapons against yourself." It is certainly true that criticisms of inconsistency have the effect of making a man redouble his efforts to be consistent.

I think I have said enough to show that Tolstoy approaches so near to absolute consistency that no American would be likely to find fault with him on that score. But this is not true of the Russians. They are, I think, the most logical people in the world. Persuade a Russian that autocracy is a bad thing, and the chances are that he will at once begin to manufacture bombs for the Czar. Convince him that private wealth is wrong, and in half an hour you may find him on the street-corner with his pockets turned inside out, distributing his money to the poor. We Americans are not built upon that plan. We sometimes get new ideas too, and

more or less revolutionary ones at that, but in our prudence we usually think them over for thirty, forty, or fifty years, as the case may be, and death at last relieves us from responsibility. You may remember the story of the Irishman and the parrot. He heard that parrots lived to be two hundred years old; so he bought a young one to see if it was true. Our ideas usually survive us, like the parrot, and we never put them to the test. There are advantages on both sides, in the Russian and in the American system. The American is less likely to go off at half-cock, and the Russian is more likely to make valuable contributions to practical ethics.

In judging Count Tolstoy's consistency we must also remember that he is a non-resistant. So far as he can persuade his wife and children to do away with superfluities, he has his way; but when Madame Tolstoy puts her foot down his very principles require him to yield. This undoubtedly accounts for the piano and the guitar. I have sometimes thought that it would be a good plan to have one of the parties a non-resistant in all marriages. As far as my observation goes, it would usually be the husband.

But on one point Count Tolstoy is very strong. No inconsistency on the part of any man, no apparent inability to live up to his ideals, should induce him to modify those ideals or weaken his principles an iota. Opportunism, compromise,—even if they find their way into your life,—must leave your principles intact. He gives as an illustration the case of the straight line. No one has ever drawn a straight line. It does not exist in Nature; yet I must not for this reason alter by a hair's breadth my idea of a straight line. It is true that I shall always draw crooked lines; yet by sticking to my ideal I may approximate the standard more and more. But if in despair I make a crooked line my ideal, there is no hope for me.

The question of consistency is in the last resort one of sincerity, and no one can see Count Tolstoy, as I have seen him, without being convinced of that. The whole man is in his frank, serious, kindly face. Although he is dressed like

a peasant there is not the least suggestion of pose or self-consciousness in his appearance. He never thinks of the gallery. Victor Hugo had many of the ideas of Tolstoy. He rebelled against the distinctions of rich and poor, of governed and governing. He showed his deep sympathy for the poor by directing that he should be buried in a pauper's coffin, and as a matter of fact his body was placed in one while it lay in state in the midst of mourning thousands. But Hugo knew that he could not have dressed as a peasant during his life without becoming hopelessly theatrical. He lacked the simplicity, the single-mindedness, which, in Tolstoy's case, convinces all who see him that he dresses and lives as he does because he cannot do otherwise. His inmost being has revolted against the injustice of the whole gentility business, and he must show it in his life or die of repression.

Q. In sacrificing the beauty of his home and insisting on living the rigidly plain and prosaic life of his rustic neighbors, do you think he is accomplishing as much good as he might do if he had retained more of beauty and culture in his home surroundings and sought to enrich and beautify the homes of the peasants and bring into their barren lives something of the joy that comes from an appreciation of the beautiful? I may be wrong, but it seems to me that the Count laid too little stress on the refining, exalting, and ennobling influence of beauty. Stern duty, in her simple and austere mien, appears to have filled his mental horizon. His splendid imagination has in a way been starved, it seems to me. There is a moral grandeur and heroism in this noble apostle of the higher life which calls for the tribute of every high-thinking man and woman, but in spite of this it seems to me that the Count has fatally overlooked the fundamental demand of life: he has not considered the lily, with all that that implies; and, strangely enough, with all his natural wealth of imagination he has failed to learn the lesson that the Creator has striven to impress on the minds of the simplest of his children. Everywhere Nature spells out the word *Beauty*, that the imagination of man may be satisfied and that he may learn the lesson

taught by a million tongues. To me it seems that he who seeks to divorce beauty from utility seeks to separate what God has joined together. Now, is it not true that Count Tolstoy has in a way repeated the fatal error of the cloister of the Middle Ages and the brutal warfare that Puritanism later waged against the beautiful? He has conceived it his duty to serve his fellow-men. Well and good. He believes it his duty to go to the poor and be as one of them. Well and good, if it is to enrich their hard and prosaic existence, giving them an ampler life, richer in all that enriches being. The spirit of altruistic service, the overmastering desire to aid the poor, as manifested by the great Nazarene, calls for the tribute of our love and admiration; but at the same time I deplore his failure to see that with his rich imagination and strong sense of beauty he might, but for mistaking a partial appearance for the whole truth, have enriched a hundredfold the lives of those about him and inaugurated a movement destined to grow rapidly. Yet here I may be mistaken; but you who have communed with him, and who know the conditions of life environing him, can better judge than I.

A. I think there is much force in your criticism. Tolstoy is a great artist, but his revulsion of feeling against the society in which he lived so long has made him suspicious of its art. The art of the day is preoccupied, he says, with three insignificant and worn-out feelings—pride, sexual desire, and weariness of life. He wants a new art built on something higher. "Art is a human activity," he tells us, "consisting in this—that one man consciously, by means of certain external signs, hands on to others feelings he has lived through, and that other people are infected by these feelings and also experience them." "It is a means of union among men, joining them together in the same feelings." If we accept these principles, and to me they seem manifestly true, we can understand how Tolstoy has come to protest against a dilettante art, produced for a small and pampered portion of the community and tending to separate men into classes rather than to unite them. In a new and brotherly world Tolstoy expects a new

and real art to arise, of which indeed he is the forerunner, crying in the wilderness, *Make straight the way of the Lord!* Meanwhile he is ready to dispense with the half-art that we have. It is another exhibition of relentless Russian logic, which leaves us unconvinced although we accept its premises. There are pretty things in life, and it is better to have them around us than ugly things; and, while it is quite true that our education has vitiated our taste, we must make the best use we can of such taste as has survived in us. To beautify our lives, where we can do it even in mere externals (without dealing unjustly with any one), is clearly a duty; and it does seem to me that Tolstoy has failed to see this. He virtually admits the claims of beauty, at least in one passage: "The subject-matter of all kinds of ornamentation consists not in the beauty, but in the feeling (of admiration of, and delight in, the combination of lines and colors) which the artist has experienced and with which he infects the spectator. Among these feelings is the *feeling of delight at what pleases the sight.*" Beauty, then, is a unifier too, and as such a proper element of art.

In considering this matter of art we must remember that Tolstoy is not an "all-round man" by any means, but a prophet; and a prophet must in the nature of things be one-sided—he must lay the emphasis in one direction. It is notable that Jesus showed little interest in external art. He was an artist in literature. (Was there ever anything written more artistic than the first part of the parable of the Prodigal Son?) (But when his disciples called his attention to the wonders of the temple architecture, he had no eye for them. Although his father was a carpenter, and he may have worked at the trade himself, yet he never dwells on form. His life work lay in another direction.) Tolstoy has not been able to divest himself of his literary art; it was too deeply bound up with his nature. His "Resurrection" shows it in all its original splendor, and Sir Henry Irving recently said that one of his two dramas was the strongest play of recent times. But he has turned his back on the plastic arts, feeling that a

divided world cannot do justice to them. If Tolstoy and William Morris could have been united in one man, we should have had an all-round man indeed. While Tolstoy has shortcomings on the external side, Morris has them on the spiritual. But would a man so balanced have been such a force in the world as either of these incomparable men? I doubt it.

Q. Do you think that the views of Count Tolstoy are having as much effect on thinking Russia as upon scholars throughout western Europe and the New World, and that he is producing a lasting impression upon the peasants around him; or do they reflect in a large measure the narrow bigotry and prejudice of the priesthood and regard him as an atheist who, though he may have a kind heart, is nevertheless to be regarded with suspicion and whose teachings are to be shunned as imperiling the soul?

A. I have no means of knowing how great the influence of Count Tolstoy is in Russia. I know of individual instances of noblemen who have followed his example and devoted their lives to their fellows. One noteworthy example is that of Vladimir Tchertkoff—formerly an officer in the imperial guards at St. Petersburg and a personal friend of the late Czar, with whom he used to play lawn tennis—who has been exiled on account of his democratic and humanitarian activities, and lives in England, where he conducts the "Free Age Press," which prints cheap editions of Tolstoy's ethical writings in both English and Russian. I met Mr. Tchertkoff last summer in London—a thorough-going aristocrat in appearance, despite his flannel shirt. It was odd to think that not so many years ago he was attached to the Embassy there and on intimate terms with the great people of London society. It stands to reason that a genuine Russian like Tolstoy must have more influence in his own country than abroad. There is something distinctively Russian in his thought and it appeals to the Russian mind.

As for the peasants, it is not easy to get at them. They cannot read, and depend upon rumor for most of their knowledge. In his own village of Yasnaia Poliana they are devoted

to him, and I was told that this village was far superior to the general run; but, as it was the only one I examined, I could not judge for myself. When the peasants do think, they think independently in the line of Count Tolstoy's thought. Indeed, he claims to have learned the truth from them. Russia is honey-combed with peasant sects, more or less inclined to non-resistance and fraternal principles. The Doukhobors, of whom we all have heard so much, are a conspicuous example of this. Nine thousand of them are now settled in Northwestern Canada, largely through Count Tolstoy's efforts, having emigrated to avoid military service, which offends their consciences. Tolstoy has written many tracts and moral tales for the peasants, and they have a wide circulation. We may be sure that they have an extended influence, following as they do the natural bent of the people.

Q. In his purely religious views, what are his conceptions, as you understand them, of Deity, of the future of the soul, and those questions over which churches have warred and great religious bodies have chiefly concerned themselves?

A. Tolstoy's religious ideas have not been at a standstill. It is easy to quote his books for almost any assertion on this subject, but the fact is easily explained when we consider the regular development of his views from the beginning. He was, until he reached the age of fifty, an agnostic if not an atheist. The faith that has grown in him since has been altogether the work of his own experience. The only use he has made of the experience of others has been in inducing similar experiences in himself, and even this he has not done deliberately, but naturally in the search for the truth. "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." Tolstoy has found this statement to be true. In the experience of love to God and men, he has become conscious of possessing an immortal soul. He told me, when I asked him, that all true life was immortal. He answers the question specifically in a recent leaflet:* "As to the question about what awaits us

* Free Age Press Leaflets, No. 4. These publications may be obtained of the "Straight Edge," 240 Sixth ave. e. New York City.

after death, I would answer by the conjecture that the will of Him who called us into this life for our welfare leads us somewhere through death—probably for the same purpose.”

But it is in the apprehension of God that Tolstoy has gained most from experience. I remember that I was delighted with his book on “Life” because it never mentions God and did not postulate what seemed to me an assumption as the best of its reasoning. As the result of reading that book I concluded that love for one’s neighbor was the basis of religion, and I told Tolstoy so when I met him. “Not at all,” said he. “Love for God comes first. Why should you love your neighbor, if you do not first love God?” I told him that I thought I did love my neighbor first, but he would not believe it: “No, you don’t understand your own sensations.” This conviction has grown upon Tolstoy until he has become, what Spinoza was said to be, a “God-intoxicated” man. His recently published “Thoughts on God”* shows a realization of the presence of God as striking as is to be found in the Psalms. I give here a few passages:

“Somehow, while praying to God, it became clear to me that God is indeed a real Being, Love; is that All which I just touch and which I experience in the form of love. And this is not a feeling, not an abstraction, but a real Being; and I have felt Him.

“All that I know, I know because there is a God, and because I know Him. Only upon this can one firmly base one’s relations with other men and with one’s self, as well as with life outside space and time.

“He is the origin of my spiritual self—the external world is only my limit.

“I found Him as it were afresh. And I was filled with such joy, and such a firm assurance did I gain of Him, and of the possibility and duty of communion with Him, and of His hearing me, and my joy grew so great that all these last days I have been experiencing the feeling that something very good has come to me, and I keep asking myself: ‘Why do I feel so happy? Yes! God! There is a God, and I need be neither anxious nor afraid, but can only rejoice.’ . . . Perhaps this is what some call the ‘living God.’

“There is not one believing man to whom moments of doubt do not come—doubt in the existence of God. And these doubts are not

* Free Age Press. These “Thoughts” are also included in the very interesting volume of Tolstoy’s “Essays, Letters, and Miscellanies,” just issued by the Crowells.

harmful; on the contrary, they lead to a higher understanding of God. That God whom one knew has become familiar, and one no more believes in Him. We entirely believe in God only when He discloses Himself afresh to us. And He discloses Himself to us from a new side when we seek Him with all our soul."

"I too for long did not name Thee. . . . But Lord I named Thee, and my sufferings ceased. My despair has passed. . . . I feel Thy nearness, feel Thy help when I walk in Thy ways, and Thy pardon when I stray from Thee. . . . Lord, pardon the errors of my youth, and help me to bear Thy yoke as cheerfully as I accept it."

Q. What would you say were the focusing points of his social theories, or upon what chief foundation truths does his philosophy of life in its larger relations rest?

A. Tolstoy's great discovery and central theory is the old, old truth that *love* is the natural spiritual energy of man, and that all circumstances, laws, and institutions must bend before this prime function of his soul. In short, he takes Christianity at its word, not because "it is written" but because he has found its truth attested in his deepest experience. All of his apparent eccentricities become intelligible, or even necessary, when we trace them back to this paramount obligation of loving. While he is not a constructive philosopher, his spirit must underlie any sound piece of construction. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." Tolstoy's great importance in the bringing in of a new day is his dramatic value. Himself a great dramatist, he has always seen things dramatically, and he has at last become a dramatic representation of the need of the age. Scenes, pictures, and events have always impressed him more than arguments and books. The freezing of his coachman at Kazan, while he was dancing at a ball, first called his attention to the grievances of the working classes. An execution by guillotine, which he attended at Paris, first shook his faith in government. It was his own experience in the Crimean war that revealed the horrors of wholesale murder to him. The contrast between himself and a peasant, as they both dropped a coin in a beggar's hat, opened his eyes to the defects of a rich man's charity. His dramatic instinct made him a great novelist and

dramatist, and made him understand the Gospels as few men have understood them. As he explains them you see the events as if they occurred in the streets to-day, and you comprehend why the Pharisees speak thus and the disciples answer so. And now unwittingly, but by an unerring instinct, he has become himself the protagonist in a great drama. Like the Roman knight he has plunged into the abyss yawning between class and class, and in his own person is endeavoring to realize the reconciliation of a world divided against itself. Tolstoy has written many great works, but the greatest is his simple, pathetic, inevitable life. If he could have helped it, we might criticize his rôle; but it has been as much the work of destiny as Mont Blanc or the Atlantic.

TOPICS OF THE TIMES.

BY B. O. FLOWER.

THE REIGN OF VICTORIA.

The recent death of Queen Victoria closes a long reign, which will ever be known as one of the most memorable in the history of England. While it is true that the splendid progress made by the British nation in the direction of democracy was not the work of the Queen, it is equally true that a reactionary monarch, like George III., for example, would have obstructed progress, even had he not precipitated a revolution. Victoria possessed little of the tyrant in her nature. She understood the temper of the age, and had the good judgment to allow the great statesman who voiced the public sentiments of the hour to remain unfettered in shaping the policy of the government.

It was fortunate for England that the young Queen was long under the influence of Lord Melbourne, who, though neither a great statesman nor a radical reformer, was a temperate liberal, measurably *en rapport* with the new spirit of the time. The early years of the reign were marked by turbulent unrest, general discontent, and terrible suffering among the poor. Had the Queen displayed an arbitrary or despotic spirit, or even favored reactionary measures, it is highly probable that England would have been the theater of war, from which, owing to the unorganized character of the discontented groups, a despotism would likely have arisen with the reactionary spirit in the ascendancy, as was the case in Germany after the revolutionary outbreak in 1848. The Queen, however, wisely elected to be a constitutional sovereign and to favor that wider measure of freedom that alone renders the unrestricted march of mind possible. Hence, under her government, England has made greater political and economic advances than during any other period of history. To appreciate this fact we have only to call to mind a few of the progressive steps that have marked the last sixty-three years. Thus, for example, the brilliant and statesman-like solution of the colonial problem accomplished chiefly by Lord Durham

in Canada, which solved one of the gravest problems facing the Empire by giving the colonies home rule and virtual independence, yet holding them as members of one great family; the revolution of the postal service accomplished by Roland Hill during the earlier years of Victoria's reign—one of the greatest reforms of the nineteenth century, whose beneficent influence has been world-wide in extent; the repeal of the corn laws, which had oppressed the masses for four hundred years; the establishment of free trade; the passage of the income tax; the enlarging of the franchises until manhood suffrage has been virtually established in England; postal savings banks; governmental ownership of the telegraph; voting by ballot, and other electoral reforms; the steady growth in popular favor of municipal ownership and other rational socialistic measures.

The relation of the home government to Canada, Australasia, and the British colonies in South Africa has as a rule been marked by wisdom and enlightenment, as the general policy formulated by Lord Durham has been generally adhered to. On the other hand, the treatment of Ireland has been far from satisfactory, and the action of the government in her treatment of alien races and weaker neighbors with whom she has come in conflict has been far from what humanity had a right to expect from a nation that aspires to be a leader of civilization.

The intellectual development of the period far surpasses that of any other reign. Not even the Golden Age of Elizabeth, made forever illustrious by Shakespeare, Bacon, and a coterie of poets and philosophers who have won a permanent place in English literature, can compare with the advance of the Victorian age—a fact apparent when we survey the intellectual progress of the last reign. In the domain of science and philosophy this age stands alone in its splendid preëminence, with Herbert Spencer, Charles Darwin, Sir Charles Lyell, Alfred Russell Wallace, John Tyndall, Thomas Huxley, and Richard Proctor as prominent representatives of the greatest philosophic and scientific revolution and advanced movement known to history.

Robert Browning and Alfred Tennyson stand as representatives of the profound and the popular in poetry. Charles Dickens, Sir Walter Scott, Lord Lytton, and George Eliot have made the Victorian era memorable by their fiction, while Carlyle and Ruskin among essayists, and Macaulay, Froude, and Carlyle among philosophic historians are but a few names

justly representative of the most brilliant era in the intellectual history of England.

The cause of ethical advance was marked by a growing spirit of toleration, especially shown in the treatment of the Jews and the Roman Catholics; while the personal character of the Queen, standing as it did in such bold and beautiful contrast with that of most of England's sovereigns, contributed in no small degree to the cause of morality throughout the nation.

In future years, when reviewing Queen Victoria's reign, it is probable that progressive historians will point with sadness to her failure to rise to the heights demanded by justice and civilization at two great crucial moments in English history. If after Gladstone had succeeded in carrying the Home Rule bill through the House of Commons, the Queen had bravely seconded her most illustrious prime minister and had signified to the peers her desire that the bill should pass, in the same way that William IV. indicated his desire in regard to the Reform bill of 1832, there can be but little doubt that the great measure would have become a law, and her reign would have been lighted up by one of those simple and noble acts of justice which add much to the true grandeur and the real strength of nations, and which in a way forward the cause of enduring civilization. And if when the Transvaal trouble arose the Queen had insisted upon England taking the broad position of leader in the procession of peaceful progress, and thus giving far more than a perfunctory emphasis to England's position as a member of the Peace Congress, by insisting that the grievances with the South African republics should be settled by arbitration, she would have won a splendid preëminence among the sovereigns of the nineteenth century, and have become worthy of the title of noblest of monarchical rulers. These great opportunities, however, were allowed to pass unimproved, and her failure in regard to the Transvaal doubtless hastened her death.

* * *

SOCIALISM IN EUROPE AND AMERICA.

I. A NEW SOCIAL CRUSADE IN THE UNITED STATES.

The plan recently announced in the daily press for the establishment of a free university, under the direction of Pro-

fessor Herron, in which enlightened and Christian social ideals could be taught by conscientious and able teachers, without their being deprived of their places and livelihood through the influence of predatory wealth, has, we believe, been abandoned. This is probably largely owing to the decision of Prof. Herron to dedicate his life to the furtherance of a "social apostolate" organized by himself and several other earnest young clergymen, who under the banner "Back to Jesus" have consecrated their lives to the cause of human brotherhood. The movement inaugurated by Professor Herron was foreshadowed half a century ago in the noble work of Canon Charles Kingsley and Frederick D. Maurice, while the John the Baptist of the present movement may be said to have been the great Italian patriot, reformer, and philosopher, Joseph Mazzini.

This group of leaders may be termed radical socialists in contradistinction to the moderate social reformers who are seeking economic emancipation by the step-by-step method. Their position also differs radically from the great majority of the socialists of continental Europe, in that while the latter incline to materialism, or at least are in open hostility to the Church, Professor Herron and his co-workers insist upon taking the spirit, teachings, and life of Jesus as their guide and example—"What would Jesus do?" being the key-note of their social evangel, which has inscribed on its banner this positive declaration: "The right of the humblest human soul to the resources and liberty needful for living a complete and unfearing life is infinitely more sacred than the whole fabric and machinery of civilization."

II. WHY EUROPEAN SOCIALISTS HAVE OPPOSED CHRISTIANITY.

It is often asked why it is that European socialism is so actively opposed to the Church, when the central aim of the reformers is the actualization of the noblest dream of the ages—that of freedom, fraternity, and equality, or the happiness, comfort, and growth of the children of men through simple justice. It is frequently pointed out that the essence of Jesus's ethical teaching is in perfect accord with the ideal of justice for which socialism contends. The explanation of this indifference to religion and hostility to organized Christianity, though due in part to the materialistic reaction which marked the rise of the evolutionary theory and which was coincident

with the rise of socialism on the Continent, is chiefly found. I think, in the action of the dominant church of the various European nations, which has as a rule systematically and vigorously opposed the republican aspirations of the people and upheld the reigning despotism. This position has doubtless been due to the union of Church and State, together with the natural tendency of strong, rich, and conservative bodies to uphold the existing order in a conflict with new theories of human rights.

Thus, unhappily for both religion and social advance, the Church as a rule has taken the side of Cæsar in the struggle for freedom and justice, and the leading humanitarian philosophers and economic reformers, when not skeptics themselves, have been virtually forced to take sides against the Church in which they have been reared, because they were impelled by what they conceived to be the demand of God to serve loyally the cause of human brotherhood, rather than declare allegiance to the religion that aggressively opposed what was to them manifestly the cause of justice; and naturally the more independent among the masses gravitated toward the apostles of human rights, whose teachings were so much more in accord with those of the great Nazarene than with the doctrines of the dominant churches. This fact is strikingly illustrated in the case of the Italian patriot Mazzini, who was passionately loved by hundreds of thousands of Roman Catholics, not only in Italy but throughout Europe, notwithstanding his bold opposition to the action of the Pope.

III. MAZZINI'S INFLUENCE FOR PROGRESS.

Mazzini was probably the truest embodiment of the Christ spirit of his time, and for that reason his life continues to be an inspiration to liberty-loving souls the world over, while his teachings were never so potential for good as to-day; but the great Italian differed radically from many economic reformers of his time. He was too great a philosopher to allow the false position of the Church to draw him to intemperate extremes or to blind him to the fact that permanent progress and enduring civilization require the acknowledgment of the supremacy of the moral nature in the life of man and the nation. He realized more clearly than did any other social philosopher of his time that *"The chief evil of the day is the fact that the intellect has far outstripped morality in its advance."*

IV. THE FATAL MISTAKE OF EUROPEAN SOCIALISM.

Unfortunately for socialism, its chief exponents on the continent of Europe failed to discriminate between the life and teachings of Jesus and the primitive Church and the dogmas of organized Christianity after it had become rich, powerful, ambitious, and arrogant, drawing sustenance from the State and touched by lust for worldly dominion and greed for temporal gain. They therefore too often looked upon religion with hostile eyes, while many of them came to regard man's spiritual nature as a sentimental and unreal figment of the imagination. Accordingly, they made their appeal to the intellect rather than to the conscience or the moral side of life. Instead of addressing at once the heart and mind of the age and emphasizing the supremacy of the spiritual, insisting with Mazzini that "life is a mission" and that the law of duty must reign supreme in the soul, and with Victor Hugo that "to love is to have justice, truth, reason, devotion, probity, sincerity, common sense, right, and duty welded to the heart"—in a word, that "life is conscience," they pitched the key-note of their gospel upon the materialistic plane and appealed to the physical and intellectual sides of life in such a way as to leave the spiritual nature in the background. The moral enthusiasm that makes a great advance movement irresistible can only be present when the ethical varieties are uppermost, when the recognition of man as a spiritual being dominates the imagination of the people and draws to the cause the most profoundly religious natures of the age. Hence, it seems to me that European socialism has made a fatal mistake in ignoring the great fundamental spiritual verities which, if incorporated in their propaganda, would make the movement irresistible. They have concerned themselves too exclusively with the bread-and-butter side of the problem, and have thereby failed to realize the fundamental truth that liberty, freedom, growth, and happiness can only come when "the egoism of intellect" is replaced in the mind by the religion of duty.

No social theory has ever been promulgated that demands more imperatively than socialism, as an essential to its proving a blessing, that the moral verities be ever kept uppermost in society. Socialism can be made the handmaid of civilization and progress only on the condition that the spirit of freedom, reverence for justice, and the loving concern for the rights and opinions of others that is comprehended in the Golden Rule be at all times recognized as a fundamental and inalien-

able right to be preserved at all times and at all hazards. Without the ascendancy of altruism over selfishness and the presence of the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount running through the web and woof of life, socialism might easily degenerate into an intolerable but wellnigh all-powerful bureaucratic despotism, whose baleful influence would first be seen in the suppression of free thought. On the other hand, if socialism is carried forward on the plane of man's higher nature, it can be made the servant of freedom and progress, developing all of the best in human life. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that no great reform movement can be carried forward to a peaceful and permanent victory or can successfully combat the sordid side of life that is not dominated by spiritual or moral enthusiasm.

V. ETHICAL IDEALS DOMINATE SOCIAL LEADERS IN AMERICA.

The social-advance movement in America has been largely permeated with a deeply religious spirit. The great majority of its exponents have been men after the type of Canon Kingsley and Frederick D. Maurice. They have in many instances sacrificed lucrative positions that they might be true to the spirit of the teaching of the great Nazarene. They have reflected in a large way the ideal held up by Mazzini in his last published utterance, written in 1872, in which he said:

"Let us remain republicans and apostles of our faith, for the people and with the people; reverencing genius, but on condition that, like the sun, it diffuses its light, life, and warmth upon the multitudes. Truth is the shadow of God on the earth, and he who seeks to monopolize it to himself is an assassin of the soul—even as he who hears the cry of an agony he might relieve, yet passes on, is an assassin of the body. Intellect, like every other faculty given by God, is given for the benefit of all; a double duty toward his brother-men devolves upon him who has more than the rest. Our life should be an incessant apostolate—in word, in deed, and in example—of that which we believe to be the truth. He who sets bounds to that apostolate denies the unity of God and of the human family; he who despairs of the intellect of the people denies history, which shows us the unlearned ever the first to seize and comprehend, through the heart's logic, the newest and most daring truths of religion."

The socialistic propaganda in America will, we believe, become more and more an appeal to the spiritual side of man's nature. If such is the case it will grow with great rapidity in spite of all opposition until it has become the religion of millions of consecrated lives. Once let the Golden Rule burn brightly as a deathless torch on the altar of the human heart,

and let the Sermon on the Mount mean something more than idle words to the Church—once let the life of the great Nazarene take hold in a compelling way upon the conscience of society—and predatory wealth, creedalism, and conservatism will be powerless to stay the onswEEPing wave of social righteousness that shall mark the awakened conscience of the New World.

* * *

OBJECT-LESSONS IN MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP OFFERED BY TWO AMERICAN CITIES.

The experience of the city of Detroit in municipal electric lighting should prove interesting to citizens of all American municipalities. According to the last municipal report, the quality of service is greatly improved under city ownership. Thus, for example, under private ownership during the year 1893-4 the lamp arcs reported by the police as out equaled 86,426, while the greatest number of arcs reported out during any year since the city owned the plant was 7,405. This great improvement in service has also been accompanied by a marked decrease in cost, as will be seen from the fact that the lowest offer made by a private company was \$102.20 per arc. The cost under municipal ownership, including interest and a liberal allowance for depreciation, was \$75.56, or a clear saving of \$26.24 per arc.

Duluth, Minn., is another American city that is proving the practical value of municipal ownership. After a year of ownership of the gas and water works the city is able to report, first, reduction in charges, and, second, a net profit of over \$15,000. The experiment has led the city to vote bonds for a municipal electric-light plant.

MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP IN GREAT BRITAIN.

The success of municipal ownership in England has been so gratifying that it is rapidly gaining favor throughout the Island. Towns that tentatively and timidly began the experiment are now extending municipal operations in directions that, were they seriously proposed in this country, would call forth the most direful predictions from the great dailies in America. The following, from Dr. Bliss's *Social Unity*, will

give our readers some idea of what Great Britain is doing in this direction:

"The parliamentary report on municipal trading reports 339 municipalities engaged in corporate industry, involving a capital of \$500,000,000. These industries, besides street-cars, gas, etc., include lodging-houses, wash-houses, garbage plants, insurance, bazaars, shops, saloons, and nurseries. The net profit on gas works alone is put at \$2,000,000. All this shows that socialism is utterly impracticable. Municipalists in Birmingham and elsewhere are beginning to argue that Town Councils should build model homes, not in the cities but in the country."

HOW A FEW CAPITALISTS PICKED UP OVER ONE MILLION DOLLARS IN THE STREETS OF BOSTON.

The dividends declared during the last year by the West End Railway Company of Boston amounted to \$1,147,950. This amount under municipal ownership would have been used either to reduce fares or in lessening the tax rate of the city, and, but for the baleful influence of private corporations operating public utilities, there can be no doubt that the inhabitants of Boston would to-day be enjoying the enormous profits rendered possible by the use of the city's highways. Instead of the city reaping this benefit, however, the immensely valuable street franchises are enriching a few capitalists, many of whom live in other States; while in return for the use of our highways the service of the car system is so poor that a large proportion of the citizens of Boston, both men and women, are compelled to stand in the cars or on the platforms, summer and winter, instead of enjoying the seat that is supposed to be the right of those who pay fares. But how could the families of our great capitalists have it in their power to spend tens of thousands of dollars in Europe or elsewhere, each summer, if the cities did not give the beneficiaries of natural monopolies immensely valuable franchises and permit them to render poor service in return—such, for example, as the collecting of fares from the working men and women of Boston for "cattle-car" accommodation in lieu of comfortable seats? Some day Good Government Clubs throughout the land will awaken the people to a realization of their rights in spite of a silent daily press and unfaithful public servants; and then will come a day of reckoning.

THE MOSQUITO AND THE MEDICAL MAN.

An interesting illustration of the uncertain character of medical theories is found in the complete revolution wrought during the last few months by the mosquito, in overturning one of the most time-honored and cherished theories of the regular profession. Should a man, even though eminent in the world of thought, one year ago have had the hardihood to have asserted that no germ of contagion lurked in the clothing of a yellow fever victim, or that the disease could not be transmitted by physical contact with the patient, he would have been savagely and mercilessly denounced by the regular profession as an ignoramus or the victim of an insane delusion: just as the famous New York alienist, Dr. Hamilton, has recently intimated that every one of the more than one hundred thousand Christian Scientists in America is insane, as evinced by their belief in the power of God to overcome certain diseases without the intervention of material remedies. It would have been shown, by evidence that would have been accepted as proof positive, that yellow fever was among the most contagious of diseases, that the house in which a person had had the scourge was full of contagion, and that the clothes were impregnated with disease germs. And should this original thinker have gone a step further, and have come from the bedside of a yellow fever patient without taking the regulation precautions to prevent the spread of the contagion, a cry for a shotgun quarantine would have gone up quite as loud, as general, and as hysterical as that raised a short time ago when a physician in Appleton, Wis., went to a pest-house, handled a victim, and then, without conforming to the orthodox preventive regulations, returned to his family and the world in which he lived and moved.

A year—only a brief little year—has elapsed since such universal and unquestioned belief reigned throughout the orthodox medical world as to contagion through contact with yellow fever patients that even to have questioned it would have subjected the skeptic to the scorn, ridicule, and contempt of the profession. But during that year a revolution in the faith of the fathers in medicine has been wrought by the mosquito and some curious medical men, through the aid of a few dare-devil laymen, who, for the cause of science, were willing to allow the mosquito to banquet off their bodies, even at the risk of poisoning their blood. This sudden change of front, like the numerous other revolutions that have attended

the medical profession, illustrates anew the fact that medicine cannot be called an exact science. The most that can be said for it is that it is a progressive art; and it is equally true that many of the really valuable and important discoveries that have proved beneficial in revolutionizing the practise of medicine, or modifying it, have come from without the regular practise and have long encountered the fierce opposition of orthodox medicine. Their beneficent influence has only been possible owing to the healthful freedom that prevailed before the regular doctors succeeded in securing class legislation or medical laws that virtually gave them a monopoly in the healing art. Legislators should carefully bear in mind the fact that this profession, which is the most empirical of all professions, is also the most dogmatic and arrogantly intolerant, and the most hungry for special privileges and class laws of any profession. True, as is always the case, the plea for class restrictive laws is made in behalf of the "dear people"; but, as Herbert Spencer has well expressed it, they (the doctors) are "moved, as are all men under such circumstances, by nine parts self-interest gilt over with one part philanthropy." These class laws have been lobbied through legislature after legislature, ostensibly in the interest of the public, regardless of the fact that the people have never asked to have their freedom abridged; and one of the most effective arguments urged by the beneficiaries of the medical trust legislation, which takes from the citizen the right to employ whomsoever he desires in the hour of sickness and gives to the regular profession an enormously valuable monopoly, has been the cry of danger to the community through the spread of contagion.

But to return to the mosquito. It has now been shown, in a manner that the medical profession seems to regard as practically conclusive, that owing to recent experiments both malaria and yellow fever are due to the mosquito instead of to atmospheric conditions in the first instance, or to contagion through contact, as heretofore has been believed to be the case in regard to yellow fever. Dr. James J. Walsh, in a recent signed editorial in the *New York Journal*, under the title of "The End of Yellow Fever in Sight," says:

"The proofs are convincing. People who have never had yellow fever have, for purposes of experiment, slept in the rooms in which yellow fever patients were being cared for, and have lived there for weeks without contracting the disease. All that was necessary for their protection was that they should be effectually screened off from the approach of mosquitoes that had fed on the yellow fever patients.

"On the other hand, it was not difficult to obtain in Havana individ-

uals who were ready to run the risk of taking yellow fever for experimental purposes. A number of them were exposed to the bites of mosquitoes of the genus *culex* (the common house mosquito) that had previously been known to have fed on yellow fever patients. Of those bitten by mosquitoes under these conditions over eighty-five per cent. contracted the disease, though many of them had been previously in intimate contact with yellow fever patients without contracting the disease.

"There seems no room for doubt. As for malaria, so for yellow fever, the intermediate host of the disease germ is the mosquito. Not the same kind of mosquito, though to any but the trained eye they may look quite alike, for malaria is carried by the anopheles mosquito—known by certain marks on its wings and the length of its palpi, or feelers. The disease is never by any chance carried by any other form of mosquito."

Alas for the orthodoxy of yesterday! How many, many lives have been sacrificed through the dogmatic assumption of the medical profession that yellow fever is contagious! I well remember some years ago, when the yellow fever broke out in New Orleans, how fear spread over the whole Mississippi Valley. One day the news came to Memphis that yellow fever victims had reached the city. The town was in consternation. People gathered together the few things absolutely necessary and began fleeing to the country. Trains were crowded. In a short time a strict quarantine was established, and the fear-canopied citizens became victims by hundreds and died by scores in Memphis, while the refugees seemed to carry the disease with them to various towns in southern Kentucky, Tennessee, and elsewhere. This was before the days of the mosquito theory, when all men believed that those who had come in contact with yellow fever patients were marked victims of the contagion. In the light of the present discovery one cannot help wishing that the mosquito had enlightened the profession at an earlier stage. How many thousands of precious lives might have been saved, which through fear, through quarantine, and through heroic but blundering medical treatment have been sacrificed!

It is far from our desire to assail the medical profession. What we protest against is its unjust and dangerous demand for class restrictive laws that shall give its members a medical monopoly. In this we believe, with such men as Professor Huxley, Herbert Spencer, Professor Youmans, Professor William James of Harvard, and numerous other leading scientists and careful reasoners, that these laws infringe on the rights of the citizen, that they are a menace to the public rather than a protection, and that they retard rather than foster the progress of science.

BOOKS OF THE DAY.

REVIEWED BY B. O. FLOWER.*

A VENERABLE JUDGE ARRAIGNS A RECREANT ADMINISTRATION.

THE GREAT TRIAL OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By Judge Samuel Parks, A.M. Cloth, 174 pp. Price, \$1.00. Kansas City, Mo.: Hudson-Kimberly Publishing Co.

A Book Study.

Nothing in history is so unutterably sad as the spectacle of a nation, which has advanced so far along the highway of progress that it has become an inspiration and a lodestone for the friends of freedom and human rights in all lands, falling back into the night from which civilization has toilsomely and with bleeding feet emerged; for it speaks of the surrender of the higher to the lower. It tells of a betrayal of a sacred trust vouchsafed to those who had followed the vision of progress; and the higher and truer the mission, the more terrible will ever be the retribution when the wheel of effect has made its circuit. Unhappy indeed is that people who slumbers through crucial moments, when the fundamental principles that have made a nation morally great are pushed aside for sordid ends; for in that fatal hour the handwriting is again traced on the wall of time—"weighed and found wanting."

Since the close of the civil war, our people have been to a certain degree hypnotized by greed for gain. A passion for material prosperity has seemed to fascinate the public mind and paralyze not only the higher consciousness but the faculty for clearly discerning between what is ethically just and right and what slothful conventionalism and wealth sanction. Even the lofty precepts, the vital truths, that rang from the lips of the Founder of Christianity two thousand years ago now fail to hold the Church true to her holy charge; and the Golden Rule and the gospel of peace are ignored, while the war of conquest is being waged for material gain and political aggrandizement, without any serious protest on the part of Christian citizenship.

Unhappily for the United States and the cause of freedom the world over, the dawning of the twentieth century has witnessed a supreme tragedy. The great Republic—which, until war was inaugurated against the liberty-loving Filipinos, was the greatest moral world power, and the nation among nations to whom the eyes of all true democrats

* Books intended for review in *THE ARENA* should be addressed to B. O. Flower, 5 Park Square, Boston, Mass.

throughout the world were turned—became recreant to her high and sacred mission, closing her eyes at once to the most solemn injunctions of the great Nazarene and to the splendid truths enunciated in her Declaration of Independence. She has allowed herself to be led astray by the spirit of materialistic commercialism, and, turning aside from the highway of progress, has become one of the vulture family of sordid and greedy nations, and in so doing has exchanged her robe of glory for the blood-dyed garment that ever clothes imperial rule. The law of right has given place to the terrible rule of might.

The action of the United States in the treatment accorded to the Puerto Ricans and the Filipinos is the strongest justification and indorsement of the position taken by Great Britain against our Revolutionary fathers that could possibly be made. If the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the brave stand taken by the Continental Congress, by General Washington, and by the master spirits of the American Revolution are fundamentally sound and true, then the Republic at the behest of commercial exploiters has committed a moral crime, the tragic results of which will curse our people individually and collectively. Indeed, some of the evil fruits are even now plainly visible. Thousands of American soldiers have perished. Thousands of Filipinos have been slain. A standing army of 100,000, instead of the 25,000 that was more than ample before we attempted forcibly to subjugate an unwilling people, will now take 75,000 men from productive labor and give to them as a profession the killing of human beings, while when not engaged in destruction of human life they will be employed in no productive work, but must be a continual burden to the hard-working, tax-paying citizens.

To-day the wealth creators of America are called upon to pay a war budget, which, including the army, navy, and pension appropriations, exceeds, according to so conservative a Republican statesman as Senator Hale of Maine, the expenditures of any European nation. Again, through this war of criminal aggression, numbers of our soldiers have fallen victims to small-pox, and through the mail the contagion has been carried to various Western States, where it has already spread over vast areas. Kansas and Missouri are to-day battling with this scourge, which in some places has assumed almost an epidemic form. Furthermore, there are over 30,000 lepers at large in the Philippine Islands. There can be but small doubt that many of our soldiers who return home will bring with them seeds of this most dreaded disease, only to scatter them throughout the Republic. These are a few evil consequences that are a part of the harvest we must reap for the crime of being recreant alike to the Golden Rule, to our noblest traditions, and to our high mission.

Nor is this all. Few people seem to realize the peril that lurks in the awful precedents now being established. The recent appointment to lucrative positions of two sons of Justices of the Supreme Court by the Executive, at a time when the constitutionality of the Administration's acts were before the bench, is probably the most dangerous precedent ever established by a President of the United States. The fact that the

present Supreme Bench may be above being influenced by the tender of lucrative positions does not alter the fact that the precedent established may be used as a warrant at a future time to distribute patronage when such distributions may influence members of the court of last resort.

Perhaps no stronger, braver, or bolder arraignment of the leaders who have profaned the temple of freedom by casting out the Declaration of Independence and the Golden Rule in order to enthrone the god of gold has appeared than is found in a work recently published, entitled "The Great Trial of the Nineteenth Century." It is from the ripe mind of an honorable and venerable jurist, Judge Samuel C. Parks, A.M.

The author was one of the closest friends of Abraham Lincoln from 1840 until the tragic death of the great emancipator. In 1860 he was chosen to prepare the campaign life of Mr. Lincoln. In 1862 he was appointed associate justice of the supreme court of Idaho, and in 1878 President Hayes appointed him associate justice of the supreme court of New Mexico. In 1882 President Arthur transferred him to the supreme bench of Wyoming. During his long, honorable, exacting, and public career he has been faithful to the higher law; hence, his words on this great question bear with them the double authority of a great jurist and a good man. In his preface Judge Parks quotes a memorable passage from an address delivered by Abraham Lincoln at Springfield, Ill., on the 26th of June, 1857, in which the martyred President uttered a warning note that should be pondered by every patriotic American to-day. In this address, when speaking of the Declaration of Independence, Mr. Lincoln said:

"I think the authors of that notable instrument intended to include all such, but they did not intend to declare all men equal in all respects. They did not mean to say all were equal in color, size, intellect, moral development, or social capacity. They defined with tolerable distinctness in what respects they did consider all men created equal—equal in certain inalienable rights, among which are 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This they said, and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all were then actually enjoying that equality, nor yet that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right, so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit.

"They meant to set up a standard maxim for free society, which should be familiar to all and revered by all; constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and, even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated, and thereby constantly spreading, and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors everywhere. The assertion that 'all men are created equal' was of no practical use in effecting our separation from Great Britain; and it was placed in the Declaration, not for that, but for future use. Its authors meant it to be as—thank God! it is now proving itself—a stumbling-block to all those who, in after times, might seek to turn a free people back into the hateful paths of despotism. They knew the proneness of prosperity to breed tyrants, and they meant when such should reappear in this fair land and commence their vocation they should find left for them at least one hard nut to crack."

"This view," observes Judge Park, "was the view of the Republican

party"; but he continues: "A great change has taken place in this country within the last three years. The attempt which was made forty years ago to fritter away the Declaration and to leave it no more, at most, than an interesting memorial of a dead past, shorn of its vitality and practical value and left without the *germ* or even the *suggestion* of the individual rights of man in it . . . has been renewed."

Judge Park's treatment of his subject is original, unique, and effective. In a dream the jurist found himself one of a vast concourse of intelligences assembled in a great temple of justice recently established for the adjudication of great criminal cases. "Its jurisdiction extends over all countries and through all ages." On entering the palace of justice, the author's attention was attracted by the announcement that the case now to be tried was that of William McKinley for causing the death of 20,000 Filipinos and 2,000 Americans, many of whom were boys between sixteen and twenty years of age. The jury was composed of great representatives of justice—master spirits in the warfare of freedom and human rights from the day of Aristides the just to the present hour. Its composition was as follows: Aristides of Athens, Cincinnatus of Rome, Lafayette of France, Alfred the Great of England, Count Tolstoy of Russia, Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln, and Grant, Henry Clay, and Bishop Simpson.

The case as presented by the prosecution, the plea of the defense, and the verdict were as follows:

"It was proved that, 'at the time the United States declared war against Spain, the Filipinos had been fighting for liberty and independence for several years, and had nearly attained their freedom; that, upon the arrival of the United States forces at the Philippine Islands, the Islanders became allies of the United States in their war against Spain; that at the close of that war the Filipinos still claimed their independence and their right to govern themselves, and denied the right declared by the defendant, as Commander-in-chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, to govern them and exercise proprietary rights in their country; that, to enforce his claim, the President made war upon them, and by that war had caused the death, in battle and by wounds and disease, of twenty thousand Filipinos and two thousand Americans, whom he had ordered there to fight, and that some of the latter were boys under twenty-one years of age.'

"The defense was that 'by the treaty of peace with Spain the United States had gained the sovereignty of those Islands, and that the President could not surrender it; that he had a right to enforce his claim to them to the extent of an extermination of the inhabitants if they would not otherwise submit to his authority.'

"For a further defense it was pleaded that, 'in prosecuting the war upon the Filipinos, the defendant was seeking to establish peace, humanity, civilization, and Christianity among them; that the war was for their own good, and, no matter how much it cost in blood and treasure, it would finally result in peace, prosperity, and happiness.'

"For a further defense it was claimed 'that the United States needed the Islands in their business; that they were very, very rich, and would be a source of great profit to American speculators, traders, merchants, agriculturists, cotton-raisers, and office-holders; that it was the true policy of the United States to expand and create a colonial empire after the fashion of Great Britain; that it was the manifest destiny of the

Anglo-Saxon race to control the world; that honor and patriotism demanded that the American flag should wave to the end of time wherever it had once been planted; and that to stop the Philippine war now would make our country an object of ridicule for a hundred years.'

"The trial lasted several days, the case being very ably and thoroughly argued on both sides. The Court was absolutely impartial. The motto of Chief Justice Marshall in this case, as in the trial of Aaron Burr, was 'Fiat justitia, ruat cælum.' His instructions covered the whole doctrine of murder and were the most admirable specimen of that kind of literature I ever heard or read.

"The case was given to the jury at ten o'clock in the morning, and at six o'clock in the evening they brought in their verdict. George Washington was the foreman. As he arose and handed the verdict to the clerk of the court to be read, his appearance was majestic. All eyes were now upon the clerk. The stillness was intense, and the interest and suspense painful. The verdict was 'Guilty as charged in the indictment.'

"Up to this time, and during his long trial, the prisoner had borne himself with a firmness (perhaps I should rather say hardihood) worthy of the man who had made that terrible speech at Pittsburg, presaging the conquest of the Filipinos. Now, as all eyes were turned to him, upon the reading of the verdict, he started as if he had received a violent electric shock, then turned deadly pale and had to be supported in his chair by his attendants.

"Then ensued a most extraordinary scene. Mr. Clay, the boldest and most self-reliant public man of this century, arose and requested all the people to remain until he had made an announcement.

"He stated that the trial which had just closed was the most important that had ever occurred in the history of this country. The verdict had been severely criticized and he thought the jury owed it to themselves and to the people of the United States to make a public statement of the grounds of their verdict; he had consulted with the jury during the recess, and they all agreed with him that, as there was to be no court to-morrow, they would meet in the court-room for the purpose at ten o'clock the next morning."

The following one hundred pages are occupied by the addresses of the illustrious jurors, the whole constituting probably the most masterly defense yet made of the principles of freedom, justice, and human rights upon which our Republic was founded, and which guided our nation until the ill-starred Administration of President McKinley allowed itself to be seduced from the path of liberty by the materialistic commercialism and corporate greed of the day. So clear, cogent, and convincing are these expositions of the fundamental demands of progress and freedom that they must carry conviction to minds open to truth, while their arraignment of the betrayers of liberty is at once severe and unanswerable.

The interest and value of the volume are increased by the unique manner of treatment employed, which has enabled the jurist to put into the mouths of the great representatives of justice words such as their utterances and lives warranted. In several instances the exact expressions and arguments of the great men of the past have been incorporated into their addresses. In other instances the words attributed to them reflect the fact that Judge Parks has made a close and careful study of the lives of his jurists and has faithfully and conscientiously

given to them only such utterances as are in perfect keeping with what the world knows of them and their teachings. The speech attributed to James Madison is a masterpiece and abounds in citations from authorities on international law and jurisprudence; while the group of addresses forms an argument well calculated to awaken the sleeping conscience and stir the dormant patriotism of the reader.

If every parent who reads *THE ARENA*, and has under his roof sons and daughters old enough to appreciate the arguments presented, would obtain this book and read it aloud, pausing before each address to describe and illustrate the lives and the services to mankind of the various great men who form the jury, an incalculable work for righteousness and progress would be wrought upon the plastic minds of the children, which could not fail to exert great and beneficent influences in the coming years.

In the appendix to the volume's contents are noteworthy citations bearing on the great question under discussion, and there is also at the close of the volume a lecture delivered by Judge Parks before the students of the Michigan University on Abraham Lincoln, which the reader would do well to peruse.

I am glad to see that competent thinkers among the conscience element of our educators and statesmen are deeply impressed with this important work. The following extract from a letter written by Prof. Edwin Burritt Smith, of the law faculty of the Northwestern University of Chicago, contains an excellent criticism and fairly represents a number of similar opinions that have been expressed by prominent authorities:

I have just read at a single sitting and with absorbing interest your Great Trial. Permit me to thank you for this fine contribution to a discussion of fundamental import. Your legal training, your long and honorable public career, particularly your participation with Abraham Lincoln and his contemporaries in the mighty struggle through which the Union ceased to be divided and became all free, have peculiarly fitted you to sound this liberty call to the children of liberty.

Lowell somewhere says: "The late M. Guizot once asked me how long I thought our Republic would endure. I replied, 'So long as the ideas of the men who founded it continue dominant,' and he assented." Your book does more than recall these great ideas; it breathes their very spirit; it brings the father of liberty into this new discussion of its principles; it speaks with their authority against the vast pretensions of those who would enthrone on the ruins of constitutional liberty a sordid plutocracy.

A chief merit of this little book is its clearness of vision. You have not been diverted by the immaterial. You speak with entire plainness, calling things by their right names. You do well to dwell on the real character of the Philippine war. It is an unauthorized, an unjust, a personal war. As you say: "Such a war, no matter how successful it may be, is a disgrace and a shame." You rightly conclude that its "ratification by Congress made it national, but did not make it constitutional." "The President and Congress may raise and support armies and call forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions"—in other words, for constitutional purposes. Nowhere are they given power to employ the forces and revenues of the United States in waging wars of conquest.

It follows from your argument that not even Mr. McKinley's reelection makes his war of conquest constitutional. We know that many voted to reelect him without full knowledge of the fatal tendency of his acts. We also know that many so voted in spite of their disapproval of his course in Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Neither the constitutional nor the moral quality of an act is determined by the number of its supporters.

This work should be placed in every library, and especially in the college libraries throughout the land, for it is a contribution of vital importance from the pen of one who is in every way qualified ably to discuss the subject.

THE RELIGION OF DEMOCRACY. By Charles Ferguson. Cloth, 170 pp. Price, \$1.00. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.

This is a strong, suggestive, and inspiring book, dominated by a broad and deeply religious spirit. The author is a philosopher, who, while profoundly spiritual, is far from evincing a narrow or dogmatic spirit. I have seldom read a work that so bristles with virile thought, presented in a striking and original manner, as does "The Religion of Democracy." True, it is at times disquieting, just as the writings of Thomas Carlyle and Victor Hugo are disquieting. It is not a book that will delight the slothful, the dilettante, or the selfish, but by those hungering for something finer and truer than the present social order it will be read with profit and delight. The author's style is very unconventional, almost as much so as that of Carlyle. Here are some lines at once characteristic of the book and pregnant with truth for the present:

"Civilizations are destroyed by great ideas apprehended but not lived up to.

"Philosophy, poetry, science, art, and the mysteries of religion are forever beckoning men on to a more intimate contact with God and with the interior and elemental world. If men would think, and dig, and pray, and paint, and carve with a perfect daring, all would be well and they would have built the Holy City long ago. But they have not faith enough: they recoil from the shock and risk, touch the deeper mysteries and shrink back. They become sentimental about God and separate the sacred from the secular. They refuse the desire of the heart and breed in their bodies a swarm of petty appetites, divisive and corrupting. The force of the divine and elemental passion in them goes to the refinement of prurient arts. And the corruption of the best is the worst corruption.

"The death of nations is in the rejection of their own most wistful desire. The truth appears, is seen, touched, handled, and debated; is accepted nationally, but rejected in fact, and crucified.

"Europe and America to-day are sick with the nightmare of their dreams. They have dreamed of Democracy, and in their dreams have achieved liberty—but only in their dreams, not otherwise.

"The madhouses are full of people that breathe in the real world but live in their ideals. And the nations are mad with this madness, and are ready to kill the Lord of Life.

"With God the thought and the act are one. The worlds are sustained in their courses, the storm rages, the birds sing, and your heart is beating because God is thinking.

"But we see that the world is full of sentimentalists. The courts, the academies, and the chambers of commerce are mostly ruled by absent-minded people who say and do not, and know not what they do.

"And those others that are seeking a fabulous chimera—what they call millions—with sharp, metallic speech like the click of a telegraph; who think in numbers only and cabalistic signs and counters; who give each other winks and tips—men that know everything and nothing, that can predict eclipses and cause them, make famines with a turn of the wrist without meaning any harm: these fantastical triflers, fooling with their punk in the powder magazine—certainly they hold their place by a slight and precarious tenure. They scarcely touch the facts of God's earth with the tips of their toes, and they are as little indigenous here as shining angels with wings. Their ignorance of values is profound. They know not how much blood goes into things. And they are practical men in the same sense as the old card cronies that sit and play in the back rooms of the saloon behind the green baize screens. They know the rules of the games that they have spun like spiders out of their own bodies, and they can play to win without troubling to think.

"The business interests of the country—mysterious, intangible thing! Do the business interests require that people shall be fed and clothed and housed? And does the doing of business mean that things worth doing shall be bustle and running to and fro, with infinite complication of accounts, and in the end that somebody shall—make money?"

"The Religion of Democracy" deserves extensive circulation. It will not disappoint earnest men and women who are not afraid to think.

THE SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE; or, Death as an Event in Life.

By Lilian Whiting. Cloth, 392 pp. Price, \$1.25. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

This volume is in my judgment the strongest, clearest, and most vital religious and ethical work that has come from the able and ever helpful pen of Miss Whiting. It deserves the widest circulation, as it will minister to the heart-hunger of thousands of people who are no longer satisfied with easy-going conventional religion.

He is blind indeed who fails to realize the fact that we are in the midst of a religious *Renaissance* greater and more far-reaching in its import and influence than the "New Birth" in philosophy, letters, and art that lit up the morning hours of modern times with golden splendor. Never since the corruption of the primitive Church has there been such profound unrest throughout Western civilization as to-day; the churches are failing to satisfy the heart's desire of the time. It is not that thoughtful men and women cease to feel the need of religion; indeed, it is because they never before realized how vital are its great fundamental truths that they have become dissatisfied with conventional theology. This thought is admirably set forth by Miss Whiting in the following lines:

"No one who is watching with intelligent interest the wonderful panorama of contemporary life can fail to discern that the time has arrived when a larger philosophy, a higher illumination, a truer comprehension, is to do for Christianity what Jesus did for Judaism. This

larger philosophy of life does not come to destroy, but to fulfil. M. Sabatier has stated recently that no one thing is more needed than a re-statement of Christianity. He feels that the Christian idea in its fullness and intense hold is diminishing."

The present *Renaissance* in religion is coming as a result of four centuries of unrest and conflict. It calls for a living, practical faith rather than a philosophic, dogmatic, or creedal theology. It is deeply concerned with the life that now is and the to-morrow of existence. The great questions of the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the right relationship of the individual to the Infinite and to his fellow-men, and the relation of the embodied soul to those who have cast aside the physical robing, together with the great fundamentals of ethics which have been by no one so luminously presented as by the great Nazarene, are concerning men to-day as never before. And about all these themes Miss Whiting writes most thoughtfully; she has a deeply religious nature, which has been strengthened by environment and education. She is the daughter of a distinguished Episcopalian minister, and for many years she enjoyed the teachings of men like the late Rev. Phillips Brooks. Thus the broadest and freest thought of the most advanced representative of the Church of England has been inculcated. On the other hand, her literary work has necessarily kept her in touch with the live thought of the age in the wide range of scientific, ethical, religious, and educational research; while her interest in psychology and psychic science has made her follow with intelligent interest the remarkable work of a number of the greatest masters in the scientific world—such men, for example, as Sir William Crookes, Professor Oliver Lodge, Camille Flammarion, Alfred Russell Wallace, Professor Hyslop, Dr. Richard Hodgson, Professor William James and scores of others who have done much to revolutionize the thought of the world in the domain of psychology. To the knowledge gained from others Miss Whiting has added the wealth of a highly intuitive nature, with the result that in this volume, even in a larger degree than in her admirable "World Beautiful" books, we have a volume that will carry conviction and helpfulness to thousands of hearts.

CONTENDING FORCES. A Romance, illustrative of negro life in the North and South. By Pauline E. Hopkins. With 8 full-page illustrations. Cloth, 402 pp. Price, \$1.50. Boston, Mass.: The Colored Coöperative Publishing Co.

No race known to history has, under like, or anything like, the same conditions, made such rapid advance as has the negro. When we remember that but from one hundred to two hundred and fifty years have elapsed since these people were savage children of the tropical forests, and that they have known but four decades of freedom, we realize how truly wonderful has been the unfoldment of life and character, even under conditions that cannot in most instances be called highly favor-

To-day scattered throughout our land are tens of thousands of negroes, in almost every profession and walk of life, who are attaining a high degree of success, while their splendid proficiency in industrial callings, as evinced in so marked a degree at Hampton, Tuskegee, and other industrial schools, merits the highest praise. The work being carried forward by Booker T. Washington at Tuskegee, Alabama, in efficiency and importance is not exceeded by that of the president of any college in America.

The intellectual progress of the race has been very marked in recent years. Perhaps the most important literary undertaking of the last year in which the colored race is engaged is that of establishing the *Colored American Magazine*, a large illustrated monthly now being published in Boston. It is a handsome magazine, and seems to be receiving generous support from the race to whose interest it is devoted.

Another indication of the literary advance of the colored race is apparent in the striking improvement that characterizes their more important recent works. The thought, expression, and the form it assumes indicate a steady advance. I was forcibly impressed with this fact in recently reading Booker T. Washington's exceedingly thoughtful book on "The Future of the American Negro," and also the new novel of negro life, entitled "Contending Forces," by Pauline E. Hopkins, a New England colored woman. Mrs. Hopkins has written a surprisingly good story. It is a novel of considerable strength. The plot is well worked out, and is calculated to hold the reader's interest to the end. As the title indicates, it deals in a serious way with the race problem. The treatment is somewhat similar to the method applied by Judge Albion Tourgee in his novels of the reconstruction period. The book is essentially a romance of love, in which the leading actors belong to the African race. Several tragic phases of life in the South since the close of the war are presented. The book, however, is frequently lighted up by delightful glimpses of the more joyous side of negro life. It is a highly creditable novel.

DISCOVERY OF A LOST TRAIL. By Charles B. Newcomb. Cloth, 282 pp. Price, \$1.50. Boston: Lee & Shepard, publishers.

Mr. Newcomb is always bright, suggestive, and thoughtful. He possesses the happy faculty of throwing off epigrams that live in the memory and are helpfully suggestive. Moreover, his philosophic ideas are always worthy of serious consideration, though the reader may at times dissent from his conclusions.

"Discovery of a Lost Trail" is, I think, much stronger than his earlier work. The chapter entitled "A Plea for Matter" is very timely and merits the widest reading. It is not strange, perhaps, that, in the reaction from a gross materialism that became very prevalent during the last century, many searchers for truths more satisfying than the soulless theories and empty formalism of science, society, and religion should go to the opposite extreme. Mr. Newcomb admirably points out the

fallacy of both positions. Altogether the work is sane, thoughtful, and stimulating. It is a valuable contribution to the best metaphysical literature of the hour.

BY THE PEOPLE. Arguments and Authorities for Direct Legislation. By Eltweed Pomeroy, A.M., and Eighty Others. Illustrated with over fifty portraits. Paper, 116 pp. Price, 25 cents. Published by The Direct Legislation League.

This work contains fourteen short but clear, strong, and valuable chapters on Direct Legislation, by Eltweed Pomeroy, A.M., president of the National Direct Legislation League, together with the arguments and opinions favorable to the Initiative and Referendum by eighty other thinkers, embracing leading Swiss, English, Australian, and Canadian authorities, as well as a number of prominent statesmen, economists, editors, business men, and labor leaders in America. It is an admirable volume for general circulation, as it will not only acquaint the general reader with Direct Legislation and its importance, but will also show him that leading thinkers of this land and many other countries are outspoken in favor of the great innovations that have proved so successful in Switzerland.

THE EARL'S GRANDDAUGHTER. By Florence Shaw Curtis. Cloth, 140 pp. Boston: James H. Earl, publisher.

This is a simple story, written in a pleasing style and told chiefly in a series of letters supposed to have been written by a young lady of culture and refinement, who through the stress of poverty is compelled to leave her mother and sister and accept a position as companion to a wealthy but philanthropic old lady. The letters are full of interesting and instructive matter, relating to points of interest in Washington, at Old Point Comfort, in Mexico, and other places visited. A thread of romance runs through the story, ending in the union of the heroine to an Englishman of rank.

THE LARGER FAITH. A novel. By James M. Coulter. Cloth, 280 pp. Price, \$1.50. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., publishers.

This is one of the most thoroughly wholesome novels I have read in many months. Into the warp and woof of a charming romance the author has woven much spiritual teaching, setting forth what he conceives to be the Larger Faith, and which expresses, I think, most admirably the New Thought as it relates to religion, philosophy, and life. The author emphasizes the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man as the central truths of the coming religion, which will rest upon the Golden Rule and hold as an absolute verity that "whatsoever a man soweth" that sooner or later must he reap. The hero of the novel exemplifies the Christ life to a striking degree, and in a quiet way exerts a far-reaching influence for good.

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.

THE conspicuous position given in this month's ARENA to Prof. Prince's contribution on "The Passing of the Declaration" is not to be regarded as evidence of editorial indorsement, although the author's frank description of certain peculiarities of the Anglo-Saxon race is true to life as revealed in history and the daily press. But this writer voices the sentiments of a large and growing body of our democratic people and illustrates a definite trend of our national thought. His intellectual respectability is typical of not a few of the defenders of Imperialism, and this fact alone gives him standing in a review that aims to present "both sides" of public questions. It is our conviction, however, that the ideals and hopes of true democracy are too firmly rooted in our national character to permit a permanent abandonment of the principles laid down by the fathers of the Republic. A timely paper that will serve as an adequate reply to Prof. Prince's article is in preparation for an early issue. It will be a discussion of the foreign policy of our present government from the authoritative pen of Judge Samuel C. Parks, A. M., whose remarkable new book forms the subject of Editor Flower's "study" for this month.

The current contribution to our series of papers on the advanced ideals of science and religion that are rapidly shaping themselves under the designation of the "New Thought" is by Dr. R. Osgood Mason, a prominent member of the Society for Psychical Research. The writer's treatment of Prof. Fiske's splendid new volume is sympathetic but candid, and is an admirable synthesis of the conclusions of this scientific authority regarding the divine principle that is operative in all natural processes.

Count Tolstoy, the great Russian apostle of justice and political and religious liberty who, recent reports declare, is very near to death, is described this month by a man equipped with peculiar advantages for a discussion of this unique sage's philosophy, temperament, habits, and life work. Ernest H.

Crosby was for some time a guest at Tolstoy's Russian home, and in this number's "Conversation" gives his impressions of the man and his teachings in an irresistibly fascinating way. The interest of this feature is greatly augmented by Editor Flower's portrayal on other pages of Mr. Crosby himself—his books, his sacrifices, and the truly Christian service he is rendering his fellow-man. The portrait of this young apostle of progress which forms our frontispiece is a good one.

The recent shocking revelations of the abuses committed in one of the New York City hospitals by ignorant and brutal attendants were almost enough to destroy one's faith in municipal governments. But it is reassuring to learn from Mr. Warne's instructive paper in this issue that institutions for the insane in the State at large are conducted along scientific and humanitarian lines. An unfailing index to the civilization of any community is to be found in its treatment of this peculiarly helpless element of its citizenship.

Miss Kellor's original study of the criminal negro grows in interest and suggestiveness. The fourth article of the series is published this month, and throws much light on the penal systems of the South. The next instalment will include physical measurements of female malefactors of the black race, showing defects, anomalies, or degeneracy, as compared with the result of European investigations. The psychologic tests to be described in the fifth and sixth papers will deal with the five senses, the emotions, and the mental faculties and coördinations—the forces that relate man to his environment. When these are defective, an argument in favor of heredity is presented, unless social causes are known and recognized.

A unique and timely discussion of an important social and political nature will be a feature of the May ARENA. It is introduced by a short argument by Editor Flower on "An Army of Wealth-Creators Versus an Army of Destruction"; and among prominent and authoritative writers who have contributed to the symposium are Prof. Frank Parsons, of the faculty of the Boston University School of Law; Prof. Thomas E. Will, A.M., professor of economics and political economy in the Ruskin College, Trenton, Mo.; Rev. Hiram Vrooman, pastor of the Warren Street Swedenborgian Church, Boston, Mass., and president of the Boston Workers' Coöperative Association; Rev. Robert E. Bisbee, the well-known Methodist divine and essayist; C. F. Taylor, M.D., editor of the *Medical World*, of Philadelphia; Hon. Samuel M. Jones, Mayor of Toledo; Prof. George D. Herron, the leader of the Social Apostolate; and Mary A. Livermore, the veteran author, lecturer, and reformer.

J. E. M.

